LIBRARY OF SECOND TEMPLE STUDIES

t&tclark

THE SELEUCID AND HASMONEAN PERIODS AND THE APOCALYPTIC WORLDVIEW

EDITED BY
LESTER L. GRABBE AND
GABRIELE BOCCACCINI
WITH JASON M. ZURAWSKI

BLOOMSBURY

LIBRARY OF SECOND TEMPLE STUDIES

88

formerly the Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series

Editor
Lester L. Grabbe

Editorial Board
Randall D. Chesnutt, Philip R. Davies, Jan Willem van Henten, Judith M. Lieu,
Steven Mason, James R. Mueller, Loren T. Stuckenbruck, James C. VanderKam

Founding Editor
James H. Charlesworth

The Seleucid and Hasmonean Periods and the Apocalyptic Worldview

The First Enoch Seminar Nangeroni Meeting
Villa Cagnola, Gazzada (June 25–28, 2012)

Edited by Lester L. Grabbe and Gabriele Boccaccini, with Jason M. Zurawski

Bloomsbury T&T Clark
An imprint of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc
BLOOMSBURY
LONDON • OXFORD • NEW YORK • NEW DELHI • SYDNEY

Bloomsbury T&T Clark
An imprint of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc

Imprint previously known as T&T Clark

50 Bedford Square
London
WC1B 3DP
UK

1385 Broadway
New York
NY 10018
USA

www.bloomsbury.com

BLOOMSBURY, T&T CLARK and the Diana logo are trademarks of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc

First published 2016

© Lester L. Grabbe, Gabriele Boccaccini, Jason M. Zurawski, and Contributors, 2016

Lester L. Grabbe, Gabriele Boccaccini and Jason M. Zurawski have asserted their rights under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as Editors of this work.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system, without prior permission in writing from the publishers.

No responsibility for loss caused to any individual or organization acting on or refraining from action as a result of the material in this publication can be accepted by Bloomsbury or the authors.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN: HB: 978-0-56766-614-7
ePDF: 978-0-56766-615-4

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
A catalog record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

Series: Library of Second Temple Studies, volume 88

Typeset by Fakenham Prepress Solutions, Fakenham, Norfolk NR21 8NN

CONTENTS

List of Contributors viii

Part I
INTRODUCTORY ESSAYS

1. INTRODUCTION 3
Lester L. Grabbe

2. THE SELEUCID AND HASMONEAN PERIODS AND THE APOCALYPTIC WORLDVIEW—AN INTRODUCTION 11
Lester L. Grabbe

3. NON-APOCALYPTIC RESPONSES TO APOCALYPTIC EVENTS: NOTES ON THE SOCIOLOGY OF APOCALYPTICISM 33
Gabriele Boccaccini

Part II
MAJOR PAPERS AND RESPONSES

1. UNDERSTANDING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE APOCALYPTIC WORLDVIEW AND JEWISH SECTARIAN VIOLENCE: THE CASE OF THE WAR BETWEEN ALEXANDER JANNAEUS AND DEMETRIUS III 45
Kenneth Atkinson

RESPONSE TO ATKINSON 58
Albert I. Baumgarten

RESPONSE TO ATKINSON 66
Sandra Gambetti

2. WAS THE MACCABEAN REVOLT AN APOCALYPTIC MOVEMENT? 69
Gerbern S. Oegema

RESPONSE TO OEGEMA 88
Lorenzo DiTommaso

RESPONSE TO OEGEMA 95
John Kampen

3. APOCALYPTIC WORLDVIEWS—WHAT THEY ARE AND HOW THEY SPREAD: INSIGHTS FROM THE SOCIAL SCIENCES 103
Anathea E. Portier-Young

RESPONSE TO PORTIER-YOUNG 121
Edward Dąbrowa

RESPONSE TO PORTIER-YOUNG 125
Torleif Elgvin

4. OVERALL RESPONSE TO THE MAIN PAPERS 131
Erich S. Gruen

Part III
SHORT PAPERS

SESSION 1

1. THE ARAMAIC DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF JEWISH APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE 147
Daniel A. Machiela

RESPONSE TO MACHIELA 157
Lester L. Grabbe

2. AN UNLIKELY MIXTURE: SELEUCIDS AND LAGIDS IN DANIEL AND IN PERSIAN APOCALYPTIC 159
Vicente Dobroruka

RESPONSE TO DOBRORUKA 168
Lester L. Grabbe

SESSION 2

3. TEXTS ON MESSIANIC REIGN FROM THE HASMONEAN PERIOD: 4Q521 AS INTERPRETATION OF DANIEL 7 169
Torleif Elgvin

RESPONSE TO ELGVIN 179
Joseph L. Angel

4. 4QAPOCRYPHON OF DANIEL AR (4Q246) AND THE BOOK OF DANIEL 183
Årstein Justnes

RESPONSE TO JUSTNES 193
Joseph L. Angel

SESSION 3

5. THE PARADOX OF *MIDRASH* AND THE APOCALYPTIC AUTHOR: FROM MESOPOTAMIAN DIVINATION TO RABBINIC MIDRASH, THROUGH QUMRAN AND APOCALYPSE 197
Paul Mandel

RESPONSE TO MANDEL 208
Kenneth Atkinson

6. APOCALYPTIC ELEMENTS IN HASMONEAN PROPAGANDA: CIVIC IDEOLOGY AND THE STRUGGLE FOR POLITICAL LEGITIMATION 213
Yonder Moynihan Gillihan

RESPONSE TO GILLIHAN 224
Kenneth Atkinson

7. SOME AFTERTHOUGHTS 231
Michael E. Stone

Part IV
CONCLUSIONS

PERSPECTIVES ON THE APOCALYPTIC WORLDVIEW IN THE HASMONEAN PERIOD 237
Lester L. Grabbe

Index 253

List of Contributors

Joseph L. Angel is Assistant Professor of Bible, Yeshiva University, New York
Kenneth Atkinson is Professor of History at the University of Northern Iowa
Albert I. Baumgarten is Professor Emeritus of Jewish History at Bar-Ilan University
Gabriele Boccaccini is Professor of New Testament and Second Temple Judaism at the University of Michigan
Edward Dąbrowa is Professor of Ancient History and Director of the Institute of Jewish Studies at the Jagiellonian University, Cracow
Lorenzo DiTommaso is Professor and Chair of Religion at Concordia University, Montréal
Vicente Dobroruka is Professor of Ancient History at the Universidade de Brasília
Torleif Elgvin is Professor of Biblical and Jewish Studies at NLA University College, Oslo
Sandra Gambetti is Associate Professor of History, College of Staten Island, the City University of New York (CUNY)
Yonder Gillihan is Associate Professor of Theology at Boston College
Lester L. Grabbe is Emeritus Professor of Hebrew Bible and Early Judaism at the University of Hull
Erich S. Gruen is Gladys Rehard Wood Professor Emeritus of History and Classics at the University of California, Berkeley
Årstein Justnes is Professor of Biblical Studies at the University of Agder, Kristiansand, Norway
John Kampen is Van Bogard Dunn Professor of Biblical Interpretation at the Methodist Theological School in Ohio
Daniel A. Machiela is Associate Professor of Religious Studies at McMaster University
Paul Mandel is Senior Lecturer in the Schechter Institute of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem
Gerbern S. Oegema is Professor of Biblical Studies at McGill University
Anathea E. Portier-Young is Associate Professor of Old Testament at Duke Divinity School
Michael E. Stone is Professor Emeritus of Armenian Studies and Emeritus Gail Levin de Nur Professor of Comparative Religion at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Jason Zurawski is PhD Candidate at the University of Michigan

Part I

INTRODUCTORY ESSAYS

1

INTRODUCTION

Lester L. Grabbe

Overview of the Conference

This first Nangeroni conference in June 2012 had its origins in a suggestion I made at the end of the main Enoch conference in Milan in 2011. I noted that most of the papers at that Enoch Seminar related to literary matters, and commented that I hoped that the historical and the sociological side of things would not be forgotten in the Enoch conferences. A few months later Gabriele Boccaccini got in touch to say that he had been generously granted funding by the Nangeroni family in Milan to host a series of "Nangeroni Enoch" conferences between the main meetings of the Enoch Seminar every other year. This generous gift from the Nangeroni family was a great opportunity, and I jumped at the chance to organize a conference around a historical and sociological subject.

The funding was provided by a generous donation to the Michigan Center for Early Christian Studies by Gabriella Nangeroni. In 2011 the "Alessandro Nangeroni International Endowment" was established to support all activities of the Enoch Seminar. The Nangeroni Meetings were specifically created as a series of small-size international seminars devoted to the study of Jewish, Christian, and Islamic origins.

Alessandro Nangeroni was born in Milan, Italy on September 30, 1940 and died tragically in a car accident in Louisiana on August 3, 1999. He was a scholar of the Abrahamic religions, a journalist, a writer, and a university professor. After he graduated with a degree in political science from the University of Milan, he embarked on a career in politics and journalism. It was at the University of Milan in the 1970s when he first came in contact with Judaism. Nangeroni was an indefatigable researcher, a great thinker, eager for truth and justice. He was open to dialogue; although critical, his criticism was always logical, analytical, and constructive—Socratic.

He devoted many years researching the common roots of Judaism and Christianity. In 1979 he spent a year at the University of Jerusalem deepening his knowledge of the Talmud, the Mishnah, and Kabbalah, giving seminars, writing

essays, and publishing several volumes. The versatility of his interests, cultivated with a genuinely secular approach, yet respectful of the religious dimension, placed him in contact with scholars and leading members of the Christian, Jewish, and Islamic worlds. In 1990 he collaborated with Cardinal Carlo Maria Martini for the famous dialogue "I and Islam." He had previously studied Islam, and in order to better understand its unique reality he learned Arabic and moved for a few months to Damascus. Later, he wrote a dictionary of the Quran, which was welcomed by the Muslim community.

Nothing can better illustrate the saying of Terence, "*Homo sum et nihil humanum me alienum puto* I am a man and nothing human is alien to me," than the extraordinary versatility of the writings of Alessandro Nangeroni. He was a true and deep humanist, a clever provocateur, and an acute observer, who pursued the ultimate goal of reflecting on each person, in their completeness and complexity. In the 1990s, before his untimely death, he taught courses and lectured in the United States at the Department of Literature of the University of California San Diego, at the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, and at the Research Center of Humanities and Oriental Studies at Columbia University in New York. He left a library of over 2,000 volumes, with more than 700 books and about 400 journals in English, Hebrew, Arabic, and Italian presented to the Central Library of the Catholic University of Milan to form the "Fondo Nangeroni."

Summaries of papers

The following papers and responses were presented in the sessions. (Note: The papers are listed alphabetically by author, regardless of whether long or short; however, the individual responses are briefly summarized after the paper to which they responded.) Needless to say, these short summaries are for guidance only and cannot do justice to the full papers or the responses to them. In addition to these, there were overall responses (by Erich Gruen and Michael Stone) and a number of other presenters to and participants in the conference, including Giovanni Bazzana, Alexander Kulik, Laura Paladino, Pierluigi Piovanelli, and Ory Amitay.

Kenneth Atkinson ("Understanding the Relationshp Between the Apocalyptic Worldview and Jewish Sectarian Violence: the Case of the War Between Alexander Jannaeus and Demetrius III") begins with detailed examination of Demetrius III's invasion in history, especially making use of recent coin data, and redates it to 90/89 BCE rather than the traditional date of 88 BCE. He also argues that the invasion was not due to an invitation from Janneus's opponents but possibly as revenge for Hasmonean incursions into Seleucid territory. He maintains that Janneus's opponents are to be identified with the Pharisees. He suggests that the Pharisees and others (e.g. 4Q390) may have been hostile to Janneus because of their interpretation of the 70 weeks prophecy of Daniel 9 and their view of the final age of redemption. Thus, apocalyptic speculations played an important role at this time. However, Demetrius III did not withdraw because of actions by Jews in his army (the Jewish numbers were probably minimal) but because of the

changing political situation in Damascus, which he perceived as an opportunity to make gains for himself. Sandra Gambetti's response expresses skepticism about the use of coins for redating the events but especially as to whether the Pharisees embraced apocalyptic views. The other respondent Albert Baumgarten, on the other hand, feels that Atkinson's thesis is more plausible than the standard explanation, citing *bQid.* 66a and *Ant*. 17.43 as evidence that the Pharisees' machinations had a millenarian component.

Gabriele Boccaccini ("Non-Apocalyptic Responses to Apocalyptic Events: Notes on the Sociology of Apocalypticism") provides one of the introductory essays. He surveys some of the literature arising from early Hasmonean times: 1 and 2 Maccabees, Judith, the *Dream Visions* of *1 Enoch*, and Daniel. 1 Maccabees and Judith are non-apocalyptic, while the non-apocalyptic narrative of 2 Maccabees nevertheless contains some apocalyptic elements. The closer the writing is to the Hasmoneans, the less apocalyptic it is, and vice versa. We should not think of "apocalyptic events." Rather than being a "natural" reaction to external traumatic events, the apocalyptic worldview is a condition brought about by previous internal dynamics of Jewish society. This is why the invasion of Tigranes did not generate apocalyptic responses, because Jewish society was united at all social levels against such an outside threat. Within a society, different groups may have different perceptions about the possibility of change, with the marginalized often taking apocalyptic ideas seriously whereas the upper classes exploit apocalyptic expectations for their non-apocalyptic goals.

Vicente Dobroruka ("An Unlikely Mixture: Seleucids and Lagids in Daniel and in Persian Apocalyptic") begins by discussing some general considerations about Persian literature and, more specifically, the *Zand-ī Vahman Yašt* (often called the *Bahman Yašt*) which is the main Persian writing that he deals with. His central focus is on the imagery of the iron mixed with clay in Daniel 2:41-43 and the parallel phrase in Persian literature. He concludes that the scheme of world empires had a long history in the ancient Near East. Lester Grabbe responded by agreeing with Dobroruka's cautions about the problems with using Avestan material but also agreeing that it still helps us to see possible antecedents to the Danielic expression. The argument that the image of iron mixed with clay comes from Persian apocalyptic writing is certainly plausible.

Torleif Elgvin ("Texts on Messianic Reign from the Hasmonean Period") asks whether 4Q521 is an interpretation of Daniel 7. He argues that the author of 4Q521 read Daniel 7:13-14 as a heavenly inauguration of Israel's Davidic messiah, and notes a number of other parallels or similarities in phraseology. A number of Second Temple texts connect elect individuals with the heavenly realm. The occurrence of a Davidic messiah at a time when anointed priests ruled suggests that the circles producing 4Q521 and Daniel 7 were separate from both Hasmoneans and the Qumran *yaḥad*. A Davidic messiah enthroned in heaven appears in these two texts, with Daniel 7:14 paving the way for the later interpretation of "Son of Man" as a messiah in the *Parables of Enoch*. He concludes that a number of texts contain pro-Hasmonean ideology and envisage a restorative messianism, though this messianism differs from the apocalyptic eschatology in other circles of the

time. There are also texts that speak of a restored people, temple, and Jerusalem without any messianic figure. Joseph Angel's response notes that Elgvin's paper outlines a development of messianism in the Hasmonean period. He accepts the eschatological similarity between Daniel 7 and 4Q521, but cautions that neither mentions David explicitly, and he doubts that the messiah of 4Q521 is heavenly (unlike the figure of Daniel 7). He notes special parallels with the Song of Hannah in 1 Samuel 1.

Yonder Gilihan ("Apocalyptic Elements in Hasmonean Propaganda: Civic Ideology and the Struggle for Political Legitimation") analyzes some apocalyptic elements that occur in Hasmonean propaganda. He proposes that beginning with John Hyrcanus I Hasmonean propaganda was shaped by apocalyptic but that Hasmonean civic ideology was never itself apocalyptic. The Hasmoneans introduced apocalyptic elements with two aims in mind: to cultivate a sense of common cause between them and their apocalyptic critics, and to persuade those Jews attracted by apocalyptic circles to remain loyal subjects. The pro-Hasmonean book 1 Maccabees subverted the apocalyptic critique in Daniel by conscripting the characters in Daniel as an ally to the Hasmonean cause. Its treatment consistently diminishes the apocalyptic character of common apocalyptic figures and themes (which are considered through the article): veneration of the heroes of Daniel, use of Daniel's apocalyptic chronology, messianism, and veneration of Jewish groups with apocalyptic ideology. Kenneth Atkinson responds by basically agreeing with Gilihan's main points.

Lester L. Grabbe's introductory essay ("The Seleucid and Hasmonean Periods and the Apocalyptic Worldview—An Overview") aims to set the scene for the conference discussion and provide useful background. The first part of the paper addresses some issues about apocalyptic and apocalypses, suggesting that the standard definitions have some problems associated with them. The same applies to standard assumptions about the causes or context of apocalyptic writings. The bulk of the paper is an overview of Jewish history during the Seleucid and Hasmonean periods, organized according to six "turning points" in this history which might have occasioned the writing of apocalypses or related literature: Hellenization, dispute over the high priesthood, attempted suppression of Judaism and the Maccabean Revolt, Maccabean fight for an independent Jewish state, the Hasmonean state, and the coming of Rome.

Årstein Justnes ("4QApocryphon of Daniel ar [4Q246] and the Book of Daniel") proposes the thesis that 4Q246 is an adaptation of Daniel 7 and also draws on other parts of Daniel, particularly texts concerning Antiochus IV (Epiphanes), such as 11:36–37. The essential vocabulary is often the same or similar. Whereas Daniel 7 shows a more detailed description of the conflict itself, it shows no interest in the nature of God's kingdom; in contrast, 4Q246 describes the effect of the people of God beginning their activity (causing rest from the sword), their full rule, and the role of God (who will wage war for the people of God and give the nations into their hand). The description of the time of salvation in 4Q246 2:4–9 appears to be an adaptation of the vision in Daniel 7:15-27, probably on the basis of a new vision (cf. 4Q246 1:3 and 2:1). Despite its closeness

to Daniel 7, 4Q246 makes no mention of any of the figures from the vision in Daniel 7:1-14—the beasts, horns, the one like a son of man, or the Ancient of Days. The dating of the text in the early second century is too early; a more likely date is after the completion of Daniel, though its eschatology is compatible with several different times in the Hasmonean period. The response of Joseph Angel argues that the dependency on Daniel is not proved, because we cannot exclude the possibility that each text represents an independent expression of a particular mode of political thinking emerging in response to the pressures of Hellenistic rule; alternatively, as independent iterations of a common apocalyptic tradition. Even if the premise of literary dependency is accepted, why should Daniel be the earlier text?

Daniel A. Machiela ("The Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls and the Historical Development of Jewish Apocalyptic Literature") surveyed the Aramaic writings among the Qumran scrolls, noting the extent to which they were apocalypses or closely related. These were in the Aramaic language possibly because this was the most common Jewish language of the time or possibly because Aramaic had a particular cache for writing apocalypses. He tends to agree with the former reason: although most of the apocalypses are difficult to date, most of those in Aramaic were originally pre-Hasmonean. If so, this calls into question the widespread assumption that they were the product of the crises during the Maccabean and subsequent Hasmonean periods, a rather significant conclusion if true. In his response, Lester Grabbe noted that apocalypses begin as early as the Persian period, and that he had already argued in an article in the late 1980s that they were not necessarily the product of a crisis or relative deprivation. Thus, it would not be surprising if a number of the Aramaic apocalypses were earlier, but it is clear that at least some of them derive from the Maccabean crisis, which we should not overlook.

Paul Mandel ("The Paradox of *Midrash* and the Apocalyptic Author: From Mesopotamian Divination to Rabbinic Midrash, through Qumran and Apocalypse") investigates the central place accorded to the human interpreter in finding meaning and lessons from material that is considered divine in origin. He argues that *drš* is used primarily to mean "public instruction." He also notes the *petihah* method of recovering hidden meanings from biblical verses and the practice of decoding divine messages that was current in the Mesopotamian East. This element common to both methods of interpretation may have been the inherently human element of this activity, as understood by the revealer-instructor in mediating the divine messages for edification of the hearers. In both *midrash* and apocalyptic literature this is a paradox. There is no mistake that it is human initiative and intellectual endeavor that creates the midrashic lesson or the apocalyptic narrative, yet the actual resulting lesson is seen as one of divine instruction. Mandel argues that this paradox underlies the fundamental activity of Jewish leaders during the Second Temple period, who saw it as their responsibility to translate this divine message for the people. Kenneth Atkinson, in his response, comments that even though the rabbinic literature represents a different world and chronological time, scholars should not be too quick to dismiss

comparison with the Second Temple situation. Also, rabbinic exegesis may help us to understand earlier methods that were then rejected by the rabbis, since the rabbinic oral tradition may reflect the Pharisaic interpretation that was rejected by the Qumran community. The events of the Seleucid period seem to have been instrumental to the development of the apocalyptic worldview, but then the Jews largely abandoned this attempt to uncover hidden meaning in Scripture about contemporary history once the Hasmonean state came to an end.

Gebern S. Oegema ("Was the Maccabean Revolt an Apocalyptic Movement?") begins with a survey of different approaches to apocalypses and apocalyptic (which he enumerates as six), before proposing to look at another, seventh approach. He does this by comparing two sets of literature, a number of apocalypses compared with the main sources for the Maccabean Revolt (1 and 2 Maccabees). In fact, his comparison expands a bit beyond the initial list of literature, and he bring in *1 Enoch* 90:6–38 (*Animal Apocalypse*), *Sibylline Oracle* 3.767–808, Daniel 2 and 7, and *Assumption/Testament of Moses* 8-10. These all assess or describe aspects of the Maccabean Revolt in apocalyptic terms, in a type of realized eschatology. In addition, Ben Sira 50:24 shows a clear change of perspective between the Hebrew version (which promises an eternal priesthood to Phineas) and the later Greek version (where a more general prayer occurs, since the Hasmoneans had taken over the high priesthood). Even 2 Maccabees 7:29-38 uses apocalyptic language in expressing belief in immortality of the soul, a resurrection, and rewards and punishments at the end of days. This shows that the revolt was prepared for intellectually by a common apocalyptic world view and that such a complex of ideas were central to at least some of the Maccabean supporters. John Kampen responds with five areas in which he argues for more work, including the rejection of apocalyptic's coming from the circle of the Hasidim and the future temple references as realized eschatology. Both Kampen and the other respondent Lorenzo DiTommaso point out that apocalyptic is defined not just against prophecy but these days includes many more influences and sources. DiTommaso is also critical of Oegema's choice of texts for comparison, but agrees that there is one "apocalyptic worldview."

Anathea E. Portier-Young ("Apocalyptic Worldviews") examines one of the key expressions of the conference, "the apocalyptic worldview," especially as it would be understood in the sociological sphere. This is often defined as the symbolic universe (or even ideology) of particular social groups or movements who believe in supernatural revelation, a hidden angelic world that affects the human world, and the expectation of a final eschatological judgment. But even though it is accepted that this worldview is found in writings other than formal apocalypses, should apocalypses be given conceptual priority in reconstructing this worldview? A worldview is not just conveyed by texts but through other sorts of social interaction. A worldview is made up of a wide range of assumptions about self, others, relationships, classification, and causality. Yet worldviews can be challenged by particular situations, especially crisis (or "limit") experiences. On the other hand, there is a continuity between apocalyptic and non-apocalyptic worldviews in the ancient Jewish communities, with many shared elements. The examples of the

wider Qumran documents and ancient Jewish novels show a wider readership and contact between even the Qumran community and the wider world. Ideas are spread in many of the same ways as diseases, especially by human contact and social interaction—though, as with diseases, there are also contra-conditions that inhibit such spread. Responding to this Edward Dąbrowa recognizes the value of her five points but notes that while information on all five can be gained in a modern context by sociologists, this was hardly possible for the ancient situation. He also emphasizes that Portier-Young has failed to explain why there is such a concentration of apocalypses and apocalyptic worldviews in the Hasmonean period. Torlief Elgvin's response makes three points, one of them in common with Dąbrowa: (a) a missing element is the personal experience (especially a mystical one) of the person with the apocalyptic worldview; (b) the sociological causes of the explosion of apocalyptic in this period; (c) the Qumran *yahad* was not the isolated community often depicted (which Portier-Young also well understands).

2

The Seleucid and Hasmonean Periods and the Apocalyptic Worldview—An Introduction

Lester L. Grabbe, University of Hull, England

My aim in this introductory essay is to give a brief historical and social context for our conference discussions. I shall first make some remarks about apocalyptic and then outline some of the key events of the Maccabean and Hasmonean history that might have influenced the development of apocalyptic thinking.

Observations on the apocalyptic perspective

Since I have written extensively on apocalyptic elsewhere, I would like to put my observations in the form of proposals that we can then discuss and test through the rest of this conference as we hear the different papers:

1. Terminology

Although it has become more conventional in North America to use the term "apocalypticism" as the noun, I shall continue to follow general European usage and use "apocalyptic" as both a noun and an adjective. The use of the same word for two separate parts of speech causes no confusion and is not, as sometimes alleged, just an ignorant appropriation of German usage. On the contrary, it has a respectable history of usage in English. After all, R. H. Charles used "apocalyptic" as a noun. We also use some adjectives, such as "academic," as nouns.

2. Definition of "apocalypse"

We begin with "apocalypse" because it is a more focused subject and may provide a lead into the broader issue of "apocalyptic." The place to start is the definition of the genre apocalypse produced by the Society of Biblical Literature working group back in 1979 and widely quoted ever since. This definition reads as follows:

> "Apocalypse" is a genre of revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial insofar as it involves another, supernatural world.[1]

This marked an important step forward in the discussion because of seeking to find formal characteristics for identifying the most important literary form for apocalyptic. However, although it is now widely cited, it was criticized from the beginning, being challenged or modified by other scholars.[2] Both Sanders and Charlesworth want a less confining definition (but see Collins's reply to Sanders[3]). The debate continues in the symposium published in *Semeia* 36 (1986).[4]

Also, despite criticism, it is generally a helpful definition, especially as worded in the basic definition.[5] However, I want to focus on the part of the definition that refers to a transcendent reality that is "temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation." As it is worded in the basic definition, it seems acceptable; however, it is given a more specific connotation in Collins's commentary. He specifies that it includes an afterlife. But why can you not have a "transcendent reality" which includes a "temporal" dimension involving "eschatological salvation" without having to look for specific reference to an afterlife?

In discussions of definitions, it is sometimes forgotten that we have to look at individual writings and describe what we see. We cannot begin by creating abstractions in a vacuum nor assuming distinctions just because several generations of scholars have made such assumptions. If we turn round and base our definitions on a particular collection of literature that fits our preconceptions,

1. John J. Collins (ed.), *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre* (*Semeia* 14; Atlanta: Scholars, 1979), 9.

2. For example, E. P. Sanders, "The Genre of Palestinian Jewish Apocalypses," in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World* (n. 3 above), 447–59; M. A. Knibb, "Prophecy and the Emergence of the Jewish Apocalypses," in Richard Coggins et al. (eds), *Israel's Prophetic Tradition: Essays in Honour of Peter R. Ackroyd* (Cambridge: University Press, l982), 161–5; and J. H. Charlesworth (with J. R. Mueller), *The New Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha: A Guide to Publications, with Excursuses on Apocalypses* (Metuchen, NJ/London: Scarecrow, 1987), 20–4.

3. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (2nd edn, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), 8.

4. Adela Yarbro Collins (ed.), *Early Christian Apocalypticism: Genre and Social Setting* (*Semeia* 36; Atlanta: Scholars, 1986). See especially the articles by D. Hellholm (pp. 13–64) and D. E. Aune (pp. 65–96) and the introduction by A. Y. Collins (pp. 1–11). It seems to me that Hellholm's attempt (p. 27) to include a reference to "a group in crisis" is particularly unhelpful. It adds a social component to the definition of a literary genre and thus begs the question of social setting.

5. See the discussion in Grabbe, "The Social Setting of Early Jewish Apocalypticism," *JSP* 4 (1989): 27–47, especially 42 n.14.

we are in danger of circular reasoning.[6] Besides, definitions are always artificial to some extent: they are often an attempt to mark off and delineate what is a continuum in nature.

At a time in ancient Israel when an afterlife was not envisaged, at least by most writers of books in the Hebrew Bible, we would not expect a prophecy or apocalypse to contain an afterlife. But once these became part of Jewish thinking, as they clearly did during the Second Temple period, then they could form part of the stock of both prophetic and apocalyptic writings.[7] Indeed, "end-of-the-world eschatologies" have remained part of the common heritage of both later Judaism and Christianity to the present day. Nevertheless, not all apocalyptic writings have such an eschatology. The original study on the genre apocalypse noted that the most consistent eschatology is a personal afterlife, and not all such writings have a cosmic transformation.[8] Apocalypses with only a personal eschatology include the *Testament of Abraham*, the *Apocalypse of Zephaniah*, and *3 Baruch* (if one considers it a Jewish writing).[9] On the other hand, many prophetic passages show a "this worldly"/"other worldly" dichotomy with an end of the present world/age implied, if not stated explicitly. It seems to me that the picture of a divine intervention to punish the ungodly, followed by a transformed age and ideal world (such as we find in Isa. 65:17-25; Zeph. 3:8-20; Zech. 8) are not essentially different from later images of an afterlife.

One of the problems with this definition is that it fails to account for much of the content of some apocalypses. Cosmic knowledge, for example, is a main ingredient of many apocalypses but it does not seem to figure in the definition above, except in the reference to "revelatory literature" and "revelation." It seems to me that the "revelation" content has not been sufficiently emphasized. This question will be considered in the next section.

6. One of the frustrations of responding to the SBL Group's work (Collins 1979) is that we are not told how they arrived at their definition. Each chapter goes through the main writings for the topic being considered and explains why that writing is an apocalypse or is a related writing but not an apocalypse. Yet this is always done according to the definition laid out in the first chapter. Thus, the inclusion or exclusion of particular writings is justified only when the definition is taken as the unquestioned basis on which to work.

7. Exactly when an afterlife entered the thinking of the Jewish people is difficult to say. Most of the books of the Hebrew Bible seem to have no concept of a personal afterlife, a view also apparent in Ben Sira. Yet a number of recent studies (listed and summarized in Grabbe, *Priests, Prophets, Diviners, Sages: A Socio-historical Study of Religious Specialists in Ancient Israel* [Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1995], 141–5) have argued that the situation may have been more complicated in popular belief and religion in the monarchic period, with cults of the dead and a number of curious statements in the biblical text itself.

8. Collins, *Apocalypse*, 9.

9. Ibid., 41–3.

3. Definition of "apocalyptic"

I have to confess to being a heretic here, at least in the eyes of some writers on the subject. I believe that apocalyptic is a form of prophecy, I also happen to believe that prophecy is a form of divination. By prophecy, I mean "a mediator claiming to have messages direct from a divinity, by various means, and communicating these messages to recipients."[10] Prophecy, then, is a revealed message from a deity. The content is unspecified because it can take a huge variety of forms, whether what the deity is planning to do, esoteric knowledge, statements about the future, moral instruction, admonitions, threats, judgements, self-disclosure. Apocalyptic has particular characteristics that do not apply to all prophecy, but one of the main characteristics is revelation of esoteric knowledge, which applies especially to the cosmos, the deity's abode, and the eschaton.

Already in 1976 Michael Stone pointed out that revealed things, including "astronomy and meteorology, uranography and cosmology, the secrets of nature and Wisdom as well as other aspects of esoteric lore not easily classified" are an "integral part of the apocalyptic vision."[11] Unfortunately, the definition of "apocalypse" in the previous section and some definitions of "apocalyptic" do not take much account of this. We must emphasize to a greater degree that an apocalypse is a type of "revelatory literature." From my point of view, as indicated in the previous paragraph, this is an essential part of any definition.

It is widely recognized that to describe apocalyptic as a phenomenon we must look at writings other than apocalypses. At least, this is the theory. In practice, however, the best work has been narrowly focused on apocalypses and generally depends heavily on the one study that appeared almost 35 years ago.[12] Therefore, in order to expand the discussion, we must look at other writings, including those in the sphere of mantic wisdom.

4. Prophecy, mantic wisdom, and apocalyptic are all closely associated

It is evident in many modern pre-industrial societies as well as ancient cultures that two or more of these activities may be carried out by the same individual.[13] Whether seen from a literary or a sociological perspective, prophecy, apocalyptic, and mantic wisdom cannot always be sharply differentiated. Ironically, this fact is already recognized in several biblical passages. For example, Deuteronomy 13:2-6 associates "prophet" with "dreamer of dreams" without suggesting that there is

10. Grabbe, *Priests, Prophets, Diviners, Sages*, 107.

11. Stone, "Lists of Revealed Things in the Apocalyptic Literature," in Frank M. Cross et al. (eds), *Magnalia Dei: Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Memory of G. Ernest Wright* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976), 439–43, quotations from 439.

12. Collins, *Apocalypse*.

13. I have argued at length that the roles of various "religious specialists" often overlap, while even the same individual may take on more than one role (Grabbe, *Priests, Prophets, Diviners, Sages*).

a significant distinction between them. They both are seen as a way of transmitting messages from God—or as a vehicle for deception. Similarly, 1 Samuel 28:6 suggests that God's modes of revelation include not only prophecy but also dreams and the priestly forms of divination known as the Urim.

The importance of mantic wisdom was recognized by Hans-Peter Müller, and more recent discussion has taken this on board.[14] However, the discussion has often focused on the importance of mantic wisdom for apocalyptic, while its relationship to prophecy has been neglected.[15]

By a strong and justified consensus Daniel 7–12 arose out of the Maccabean crisis of the mid-second century BCE. But this does not mean that the writer did not have the visions and heavenly experiences described, or at least something similar. As argued elsewhere, Daniel 11 shows extensive knowledge of Hellenistic history, most likely by someone educated in Greek literature.[16] But this is not necessarily incompatible with visionary experiences; on the contrary, learning and mystical or mantic experiences are frequent companions in history.

Thus, the historical context of Daniel 7–12 is the crisis relating to the suppression of Jewish religion under Antiochus IV. In this case the writer seems to represent a group or community, with his references to the *maśkîlîm* (Dan. 11:33, 35; 12:3). But his interest in visions suggests at least the possibility that the author of Daniel 7–12 could have been a visionary himself. Or he could have been an editor who took over certain traditions in the name of Daniel and put them in order, or he could have been a clever scribe who drew on his knowledge of Jewish tradition and the wider Hellenistic world to create these chapters. These are all possibilities.

In discussing Jewish mantic writings, we face a considerable problem in that some scholars have difficulty in admitting that such existed in Judaism or at least wish to confine the mantic arts to marginal activity. Without discussing the entire subject of mantic wisdom, I can say that this view is wrong for the subject of astrology which is one prime form of mantic wisdom. True, we can find statements of condemnation, such as *Sib. Or*. 3:213–64. Philo comments that Abraham had been an astrologer but left the practice, which is represented by means of allegory in his migration from Ur of the "Chaldeans" (*De Abrahamo* 62–84). On the other hand, Artapanus asserts that Abraham taught astrology to the Egyptians

14. Müller, "Magisch-mantische Weisheit und die Gestalt Daniels," *UF* 1 (1969), 79–94; "Mantische Weisheit und Apokalyptik," *Congress Volume, Uppsala 1971* (VTSup 22; Leiden: Brill, 1972), 268–93.

15. The close relationship of prophecy and mantic wisdom was recognized already by James C. VanderKam, "The Prophetic-Sapiential Origins of Apocalyptic Thought," in James D. Martin and Philip R. Davies (ed.), *A Word in Season: Essays in Honour of William McKane* (JSOTSup 42; Sheffield: University Press, 1986), 163–76.

16. Grabbe, "A Dan(iel) for All Seasons: For Whom Was Daniel Important?" in John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint (eds), *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (The Formation and Interpretation of Old Testament Literature 2 = VTSup 83; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 1.229–46.

(Eusebius, *Prep. Evan*. 9.18.1). Similarly, the writer known as Pseudo-Eupolemus says that Abraham taught astrology to the Phoenicians (Eusebius, *Prep. Evan*. 9.17.3–4). Josephus quotes with approval the statement ascribed to Berossus that Abraham was skilled in the "heavenly science" and taught it to the Egyptians (*Ant*. 1.7.2 §158; 1.8.2 §§166–8). The astrological texts from Qumran reinforce this impression of a general acceptance of astrology (e.g. the Qumran *brontologion* [4Q 318 II ii 6–9]).

5. The old dichotomy of history versus myth distorts the discussion

The definitions used to distinguish "prophecy" from "apocalyptic" are often problematic. One of these is to assume a major difference between "this worldly" actions and events and "other worldly" ones, which is so important in some discussions (e.g. Paul D. Hanson).[17] No one can doubt the importance of myth for the apocalyptic worldview. The problem is the supposition that prophecy has a historical worldview but that apocalyptic has a mythical one. As J. J. M Roberts had already pointed out in criticism of Hanson, this is a false dichotomy.[18] The worldview of the prophets is as mythical as the worldview of the apocalypticists.

It is highly artificial to categorize by assumptions about what things might be actually possible in "real history" in contrast to those that could only be "mythical." In any case, a good deal that we find in prophetic literature can only be categorized as mythical. Whether we mean Elijah's chariot of fire, Ezekiel's cherubim or his heavenly journeys, or Isaiah's Yhwh whose train fills the temple, the prophets were not inhabiting a world essentially different from those who wrote (dreamed, had visions, experienced) the apocalyptic scenarios. To say that Isaiah 65 represents only an extension of present conditions (people just live longer or inhabit an idealized society) but Daniel 12 shows a break with present conditions, is to make a distinction that the ancients, whether prophets or apocalypticists (as well as most moderns), would not have understood. How can a lion eating straw like an ox (Isaiah 11:7) be less mythical than shining like the stars of heaven (Daniel 12:3)? The divine council of Micaiah (1 Kings 22:19–23) is mythical. The innumerable heavenly soldiers of Elisha, waiting to fight for Israel, are part of a mythical heavenly world that affects—and effects—events on earth (2 Kings 6:15–18). The angel of Yhwh who destroys 185,000 Assyrians is mythical (2 Kings 19:35/Isaiah 37:36), but no less mythical is Yhwh's causing an earthquake or destroying Jerusalem through Nebuchadnezzar. Earthquakes are caused by the movement of tectonic plates and other geological processes, not by Yhwh

17. In several of his discussions, Paul Hanson has emphasized that prophecy relates to "real" history while apocalyptic represents a mythical worldview: *The Dawn of Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1973); "Apocalypticism," *IDBSupp* (1976): 29–31; "Apocalypses and Apocalypticism: The Genre; Introductory Overview," *ABD* (1992): 1.279–82.

18. Roberts, "Myth Versus History: Relaying the Comparative Foundations," *CBQ* 38 (1976): 1–13.

stamping his foot. Just because earthquakes are historical phenomena does not make Amos 9:1-6 less mythical than Zechariah 14:4-5.

To the apocalypticist the events he describes are no less real than those of "real history"—these events *are* "real history." There is of course no reason why we as modern twenty-first-century people should not distinguish between myth and history. There is no reason why we should not reject the apocalyptic worldview as a historicizing of myth. We rightly view the fundamentalist interpretation of Daniel, Revelation, and history as incompatible with a modern scientific worldview. Where we go wrong, though, is trying to impose this distinction on an ancient literature whose writers would not have understood it at all. We cannot distinguish between apocalyptic and prophetic on the basis of what might be historically possible from a scientific point of view. Furthermore, the worldview of the prophets is as mythical as that of the apocalypticists. The idea of "this world" and the "world to come" is very much an idea of the prophets. The prophetic writings are filled with a dualistic perspective according to which the earthly mimics the heavenly.

I would suspect that what lies behind such distinctions is a very modern preoccupation with God's actions. The obsession with seeing the world in terms of myth and history seems to be a holdover from the Biblical Theology Movement.[19] Religious people with liberal views find miracles in the old biblical sense, as literal events, unacceptable; however, to see them as normal but unusual events within the laws of nature is all right. If God lets the Israelites pass through Sinai but drowns the Egyptians by an unusual combination of winds and tides, this is acceptable, but Heaven forfend that we should imagine a sea dividing before Moses à la Cecil B. DeMille. One is historical and one is mythical. We are still in thrall to the Biblical Theology Movement.

We know of many prophetic passages which envisage an eschatology with a transformed earth. Unless we perversely label such passages as Isaiah 2:2 and Micah 4:4 as examples of apocalyptic eschatology, something is wrong with the distinctions being made. Apocalyptic eschatology is supposed to have the "end of the world" as one of its characteristics. But "end of the world" is a flexible term which can mean anything from the peaceful transformation of the present world to the violent destruction of the physical earth and life. The common denominator is that something significantly better replaces the present troubled lives that we all presently lead, whether on the individual, the national, or the cosmic level. As will be obvious, many prophetic passages have an "end of the world" perspective in some sense. The "this worldly"/"other worldly" dichotomy is, therefore, a red herring in the discussion. This belief is only a backdrop to the literary productions.

6. Is apocalyptic scribal, in contrast to prophecy which is oral?

The scribal nature of apocalyptic was brought forcefully to scholarship's attention

19. Barr, *Old and New in Interpretation: A Study of the Two Testaments* (London: SCM, 1966), 65–102.

by the seminal article of Jonathan Smith.[20] But does this mean that prophetic literature is not scribal? It may be—and probably is—the case that some prophetic books (or at least parts of them) originated in the oral teaching of a prophetic figure, but what we have before us in the form of prophetic books is a scribal product. Similarly, is it not possible that some apocalyptic writings originated in the preaching of a prophetic figure or record in some form or other his visionary experiences? It is simply not true that an essential difference between prophecy and apocalyptic is oral preaching versus scribal creation. The scribal contribution to prophetic books has been long recognized, but it gets forgotten because of the pursuit of the *ipsissima verba* of the prophetic figure. Apart from the difficulty of determining these where they existed, it is an unwarranted assumption to believe that all prophetic writings originated in oral preaching.

7. The social setting of apocalyptic

This is perhaps where most controversy arises. The main problem with most apocalyptic writings is that they contain no information on the social context or setting in which they originated, i.e. they are often given a fictional setting. A protest that this "limitation cannot be overcome by adopting ideal models from cultural anthropology and deducing social settings from them"[21] is well taken, since I have also spoken out against the misuse of the social sciences in biblical study.[22] Unfortunately, assumptions are often made about the setting, and the previous models were based on even less substantial assumptions than those based on social anthropology. Some of these assumptions sound plausible on the surface but are not supported by actual sociological evidence. For example, it is often assumed that apocalyptic arises in times of trauma or crisis. The fact is, apocalyptic does not necessarily arise in times of crisis nor is it always a product of the oppressed, the marginalized, and the powerless.[23] It seems clear that at least some apocalyptic writings have nothing to do with the various causes often alleged for them, whether millenarian movements, times of crisis, feelings of deprivation or relative deprivation or powerlessness, nor with any extraordinary

20. Smith, "Wisdom and Apocalyptic," in Birger A. Pearson (ed.), *Religious Syncretism in Antiquity* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1975), 131–56.

21. Collins, "Apocalypses and Apocalypticism: Early Jewish Apocalypticism," *ABD* (1992): 1.282–8.

22. I have argued that alleged social science models are often based on particular theological views and really have little or nothing to do with the social sciences. See Grabbe, "Sup-urbs or Only Hyp-urbs? Prophets and Populations in Ancient Israel and Socio-historical Method," in Lester L. Grabbe and Robert D. Haak (eds), *"Every City Shall Be Forsaken": Urbanism and Prophecy in Ancient Israel and the Near East* (JSOTSup 330; Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 93–121, especially 121–3.

23. This point was already made in my 1989 article (Grabbe, "The Social Setting of Early Jewish Apocalypticism").

sense of alienation. These may be the case, but they are not the sole cause of apocalyptic perspective.

We have a few examples in which the context of a particular apocalyptic writing is known.[24] Although it is not possible to look at these in detail, I have examined two apocalypses that arose out of millenarian movements, and there are further examples elsewhere. Yet I do not want it to be assumed that all apocalypses arise in such a context or, vice versa, that a millenarian movement will normally produce apocalyptic writings.[25]

Apocalypses can be the product of clever and learned scribes or writers who produce them in their study, based on a strong apocalyptic tradition. That is, the apocalyptic tradition has its own momentum that will lead to the production of further apocalypses in a variety of social contexts and conditions. (The same is true of prophecies.) Apocalyptic is often a matter of heritage. Today evangelical Christians have an apocalyptic worldview, many expecting the imminent rapture and return of Jesus Christ, yet most are not particularly living in crisis. Wealthy Texas oilmen may well have a sign on their car dashboard, "Ride with me at your peril; I'm leaving with the rapture." As Kenneth Burridge has noted, "By and large, the participants in Californian apocalyptic, charismatic, and prophetic movements do not reveal those relative deprivations, frustrations, etc. so beloved by so many of the students of the phenomena."[26]

To sum up this section, the apocalyptic perspective or mind can be gleaned from a variety of writings and social situations, not just apocalypses. Prophecy, mantic wisdom, and other related writings show or discuss some of the main components of apocalyptic, viz. the revelation of esoteric knowledge assumed to be divine in origin, including knowledge of the heavens and God's throne, cosmology, the calendar, the future, the divine plan, eschatology, and instruction in righteousness. These revelations may be ascribed to various media of disclosure: visions, a heavenly messenger, God's direct word, or an esoteric writing, though the mode of revelation is not always specified.

Survey of Hasmonean History: Six Turning Points[27]

Although apocalyptic speculation might arise in a range of contexts, yet we

24. See Grabbe, "Prophetic and Apocalyptic: Time for New Definitions—and New Thinking," in Lester L. Grabbe and Robert D. Haak (eds), *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic, and their Relationships* (Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplements 46; London and New York: T&T Clark International, 2003), 107–33.

25. Grabbe, "The Social Setting of Early Jewish Apocalypticism."

26. Burridge, "Reflections on Prophecy and Prophetic Groups," *Semeia* 2l (1982): l02.

27. For more detailed information on Hasmonean history, see Grabbe, *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian: Vol. I: Persian and Greek Periods; Vol. II: Roman Period* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992; British edition in one-volume paperback, London: SCM, 1994), Ch. 5;

also know that there are examples where a religious crisis in Judaism evoked apocalyptic writings. I shall now survey Hasmonean history, drawing attention to six periods of crisis or semi-crisis that might have encouraged an apocalyptic reaction.

1. Hellenization

Hellenization has so often been used in a negative sense in discussions of Jewish history that I must immediately correct this view. The coming of the Greeks to the Near East did not displace the prior civilizations. A new element was added to the mix. What we call the "Hellenistic world" was a synthesis of all the elements that we associate with the earlier ancient Near East plus that which the Greeks brought. The Jews were part of the Hellenistic world from the beginning and were no more insulated from its effects than any other Near Eastern people.

But one of the characteristics of the Hellenistic world was the variation in how different levels of society were influenced by Greek culture. The lifestyle of the Palestinian peasant probably varied little from the days of ancient Sumer to the British mandate. It was the wealthier and better educated of native societies who were most affected by elements of Greek culture and lifestyle. The Jews experienced Hellenization from the beginning of the Greek invasion. Hellenism did not come to Jerusalem in 175 BCE; by that time the Jews had been under Greek rule and the Greek shadow for 150 years.

There were several consequences of this in our context. Judah's economy seems to have improved considerably, judging from the tribute that appears to have been collected by the governing power. Many Jews wanted to see Jerusalem and Judah have a higher profile and be more strongly integrated into the wider Hellenistic world. They wanted to benefit more from Greek culture. Some have also argued that apocalyptic is a Hellenistic phenomenon.[28] However, we also know that apocalyptic was a significant element in the Persian and Hellenistic Near East; indeed, some would see it as a product of Iranian influence, though this is very speculative.[29] We are reasonably certain that some Jewish apocalyptic writings arose during the early part of the Greek period, for whatever reason.[30] The *Book*

A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period 3: The Maccabean Revolt and the Hasmonean Kingdom (175 BCE to 63 CE) (Library of Second Temple Studies; London and New York: T&T Clark International, in preparation).

28. See, e.g. Hans Dieter Betz, "On the Problem of the Religio-Historical Understanding of Apocalypticism," in Robert W. Funk (ed.), *Apocalypticism* (Journal for Theology and the Church 6; New York: Herder and Herder, 1969), 134–56.

29. For discussion and references to both primary and secondary sources relating to Iranian influence, see Grabbe, *A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period 1: Yehud: A History of the Persian Province of Judah* (London and New York: T&T Clark International, 2004), 361–4. Cf. also Martin Rist, "Apocalypticism," *IDB* (1962): 1.157–61.

30. See Grabbe, *A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period 2: The Coming of the Greeks: The Early Hellenistic Period (335–175 BCE)* (Library of Second Temple

of Watchers of *1 Enoch* is probably one of these, and possibly the only one still extant, but it continues an apocalyptic tradition that probably goes back at least to the Persian period.

2. Dispute over the high priesthood

We are fortunate in having a lot of information on the crisis that developed about 175 BCE. The Jews had been under Seleucid rule for twenty-five years, after previously having been under Ptolemaic rule for a century. The one who became Antiochus IV had been a hostage in Rome for many years, but he had been released and was on his way back to Syria when he heard of the death of his brother Seleucus IV in 175 BCE. This gave him the opportunity to take the Seleucid throne. Thus began the reign of one of the most promising and possibly one of the most able of the Seleucid rulers; however, like his father, he had history against him. Holding on to the ambitions of an expanded Seleucid empire, Antiochus spent the first five years of his reign accumulating the necessary resources to take appropriate action.

The high priest at the beginning of Antiochus's reign was Onias III. The high priesthood had been in the Oniad family for many generations. At this point, another family becomes important for the story, three brothers from the "tribe of Benjamin." Although some have taken this to mean that they were literal Benjaminites, it is now generally agreed that they were actually priests. If they were not priests, it seems strange that one was a temple warden (*prostatēs tou hierou* [2 Macc 3:4]) and another eventually high priest, yet without ever being accused of non-priestly activity in hostile sources. One brother was this Simon, another was named Menelaus, and the third was Lysimachus.

A dispute arose between Simon and the high priest Onias. Unable to get his way, Simon went to Seleucus IV and accused Onias of conspiracy. Onias journeyed to Antioch to protect himself, but before he got there Antiochus IV came to the throne. When Onias's appeal eventually came to Antiochus, it was apparently unsuccessful since Onias remained in Antioch.

Soon after Antiochus began to rule, Onias III's brother Jason took advantage of Onias's difficulties by applying to the new king to obtain the high priesthood for himself, promising to pay the large sum of 360 talents (probably the regular tribute) plus another 80 talents. In addition he paid a further 150 talents to have Jerusalem made into a Greek foundation with a gymnasium and ephebeion (institutes for Greek education), and a body of citizens known as Antiochenes. It is clear from these measures that Jason wished to make Jerusalem an official *polis* or city on the Greek model.

What was the significance of this? The sources, primarily 1 and 2 Maccabees, see this as a thoroughly bad thing, and many modern writers have spoken disparagingly of "Hellenism." However, the situation is often misinterpreted. No doubt the Maccabean Revolt later included reactions against certain elements of

Studies 68; London and New York: T&T Clark International, 2008), 260–2, 306–11; cf. also 150–1.

Hellenization which were the most overt symbols of the Seleucid oppression, a common factor in anti-colonial revolts. But many elements of Greek culture were already a part of the Jewish world and were probably not even recognized as such. More important is the fact that Hasmonean rule brought no changes in the status of Hellenistic culture in Judea. Thus, the claim often made that the Maccabean Revolt was a revolt against Hellenism is misleading.

The indication is that most of the inhabitants of Jerusalem welcomed Jason's "Hellenistic reform." But did the act of making Jerusalem into a *polis* cause a breach of Jewish law? Although both 1 and 2 Maccabees castigate Jason's actions as impious in general terms, neither is able to bring any real evidence for the breaking of specific Jewish laws. Despite his intense passion against Jason, the most that the author of 2 Maccabees can say is that the priests "neglected" the sacrifices of the temple by going to watch games when the summons for the discus came (2 Macc. 4:14). This hardly constitutes a major breach of religious rules. There is no reason to think the priests had to remain on duty twenty-four hours a day, and those not occupied were no doubt glad of a brief diversion. But the temple service itself was not impaired in any way. We know this because when it was later interfered with, the sources cry out about it in no uncertain terms.

Breach of Jewish law by Jason is sometimes claimed. For example, it has often been stated that the Jewish youths exercised naked, to the scandal of the more conservative. Another charge is that they may even have incorporated pagan ceremonies into the gymnasium routine, since it was customary to dedicate a gymnasium to the god Hermes. Again, there is no evidence for either of these. It was not a universal custom for exercise to be done in the nude (cf. Thucydides 1.6.5–6) and the Jews could have done their athletics in loincloths. Furthermore, while it was also normal for the Greek gymnasia to be dedicated to Hermes, we have no indication this was the case in Jerusalem. We have to keep in mind that the author of 2 Maccabees is looking for any possible indication of scandal, and he is able to give none. His silence about both concerns is a strong indication that there was neither nude exercise nor any pagan ceremonies connected with Jason's gymnasium.

There are only two hints of anything contrary to traditional Jewish practice in our literature. One is the statement that in honor of the quadrennial games at Tyre, Jason dispatched a sum of money to pay for sacrifices to "Hercules" (i.e. Melqart, the god of the city). While Jason no doubt sent a sum of money in honor of the games, it is uncertain that it was intended for pagan sacrifice. 2 Maccabees 4:18–20 shows that the money was actually used to pay for war galleys. The claim is made that the messengers were the ones who changed the purpose, but this seems unlikely. More believable is that Jason meant the money to be so used from the beginning, and the author of 2 Maccabees only quotes a malicious rumor.

A second hint at unlawful behavior is the statement in 1 Maccabees 1:15 that "they" removed the marks of circumcision, as if this was universal. Common sense dictates that this was done by a very small minority since the operation would be a very traumatic one requiring a high degree of motivation (to say the least), as is made clear by a description of the operation in a classical medical

treatise (Celsus 7.25.1). Those who did this were probably part of a small hardcore who wanted to attend games in the wider Hellenistic world. But this is the only charge of religious violation against the gymnasium which seems to stick, and we do not know that it was condoned by Jason himself. Interestingly, 2 Maccabees is silent on this, while Josephus ascribes it only to the followers of Menelaus (*Ant*. 12.5.1 §241, though his account is somewhat confused).

Thus, in spite of serious questions about legitimacy, Jason's move to take the high priesthood seems to have been successful, and he held the office for three years. However, at this time Menelaus resorted to the same maneuver, promising Antiochus an even larger sum, if he could have the high priesthood. He thus obtained Antiochus's approval to oust Jason who fled Jerusalem. It is often stated that Menelaus was an "extreme Hellenizer"; however, this designation does not appear very appropriate for several reasons. First, it seems that Jason's "Hellenistic reform" came to an end as such. That is, Jason's supporters are unlikely to have welcomed Menelaus, and the latter had no motivation to continue the gymnasium or other activities of the *polis*. Indeed, when opposition came to the surface, prominent in it were members of the *gerousia* who had been Jason's supporters. Secondly, none of Menelaus's actions have anything particularly Hellenistic about them. Apart from his Greek name we would not know that he differed from previous high priests who fought over the office; on the contrary, all that he did suggests a concern for power only. Thirdly, the cult which later became established at the temple, although "pagan," was not particularly Greek in character (see below). If it was partly or mainly the doing of Menelaus as some think, it would still not earn him the name "Hellenizer."

Menelaus had promised an impossible sum for his office (perhaps as much as an annual fee of 890 talents), so it is hardly surprising that he failed to pay. The king summoned him to Antioch. While waiting for Antiochus who was away, Menelaus is alleged to have instigated the death of Onias III. Onias's son, often referred to as Onias IV, fearing for his life fled to Egypt. He is said to have obtained permission from Ptolemy to build a Jewish temple in Leontopolis, modeled on the temple in Jerusalem. This temple continued to function until the first century CE. Meanwhile, Menelaus's brother Lysimachus was temporarily in charge in Jerusalem. When it became rumored that he and others were engaged in plundering the temple by selling off various of the golden vessels, a riot broke out, and Lysimachus was killed.

It is important to notice that this is the first report of any reaction from the people of Jerusalem as a whole. For several years under Jason, the Hellenistic reform had been in effect, yet there had been no indication of widespread dissatisfaction with things. No doubt there were grumbles among the more conservative, especially those living outside Jerusalem. In the eyes of some Jason would have been considered a usurper, yet we have no hint of any overt reaction. Jason's reform was apparently accepted with scarcely a ripple, whatever the gossip in the wine houses and vegetable markets. When the people did finally take to the streets, it was not because Jerusalem had been made into a Greek *polis* but because temple vessels were (allegedly) being stolen. Religious sensibilities had been offended

but not by Hellenization as such. Thus, when Antiochus returned to Antioch, a delegation from the Jerusalem *gerousia* (ruling council or Sanhedrin) appeared before him to present charges against Menelaus, but Menelaus got off through a bribe. It should be borne in mind that the *gerousia* was made up of citizens of the new Hellenistic aristocracy of Jerusalem set up by Jason, not of individuals who opposed the reform (of which we have so far heard nothing in our sources).

To summarize this section, the main religious issues concerned the temple and the high priesthood. The "Hellenistic reform" of Jason does not appear to have infringed Jewish law (beyond Jason's taking of the high priesthood, which was illegitimate). The temple continued to function and the regular sacrifices proceeded to be offered as they had for centuries. The institution of a gymnasium and all that it implied did not make the citizens of Jerusalem any different from many Jews in the diaspora. Many Jews in Egypt, Syria, and Asia Minor practiced their religion devoutly yet also entered the gymnasium and obtained a Greek education, witnessed Greek entertainments, spoke the Greek language, and otherwise participated in the Greek culture surrounding them. Why should this pass without question in the diaspora but be condemned in Jerusalem? The issue in Jerusalem was not the new constitution as such but such questions as who was the legitimate high priest and, after 168, whether they were allowed to worship according to the traditions of their ancestors.

3. Attempted suppression of Judaism and the Maccabean Revolt

None of our sources gives a coherent portrayal of the events leading up to the supression of Jewish worship and the Maccabean Revolt (the chronological scheme followed here is my own reconstruction[31]). For example, 1 Maccabees records only one invasion of Egypt. From other sources we know that Antiochus invaded Egypt twice. The first time was about November 170 when he successfully defeated Ptolemy VI and then forced an alliance by marrying his daughter off to him (cf. Dan. 11:28; 1 Macc. 1:16–24). On his way back in September 169 he entered the Jerusalem temple, with Menelaus, and took away a good deal of the gold. Some think that he attacked the city at this time, but there is no reason why he should have engaged in any fighting. There is no evidence that any resistance was offered to his initial entry. And when he took the temple money, he does not seem to have interfered with the temple cult. Thus, no violence seems to have taken place at this time (cf. Dan. 11:28).

In the spring of 168 he invaded Egypt once again, but this time things were different (Dan. 11:29-30; 2 Macc. 5:1-17). Although he was victorious over the Egyptians, the Romans intervened and forced him to withdraw (July 168). While Antiochus was fighting in Egypt, a rumor arose that he had been killed. Jason took the opportunity to invade Jerusalem with a large force in an attempt to regain the

31. Discussed and defended in Grabbe, "Maccabean Chronology: 167–164 or 168–165 BCE?" *JBL* 110 (1991): 59–74.

office of high priest. He was initially successful in entering the city, but Menelaus took refuge in the Acra. Eventually, Jason's forces were repulsed and Jason himself was forced to flee. It was probably then that news of Jason's siege of Menelaus came to Antiochus's ears, and he sent a force to put down what he thought was a revolt. His army is said to have killed 40,000 inhabitants and enslaved another 40,000, but these numbers are probably exaggerated since the city was unlikely to have been so large at that time. He left a viceroy (*epistatēs)* named Philip to keep the people in line. Later he sent Apollonius the Mysiarch (i.e. in charge of a contingent of Mysian soldiers) who took Jerusalem with violence, killing and enslaving a large number of people. Finally, sometime after this, Geron the Athenian (or "an elderly Athenian") was sent to compel the Jews to leave their ancestral laws.

The accounts at this point leave us with some major difficulties. If Antiochus took the city and put down the revolt, why was there need to send Apollonius to take the city by subterfuge sometime later (2 Macc. 5:23-26; 1 Macc. 1:29-36)? Moreover, Apollonius is said to have enslaved the inhabitants, a strange move after Antiochus had already slain or enslaved practically all of them! We are simply not given sufficient data and can only make informed guesses at best. The real puzzle is why a little later Antiochus feel it necessary to send Geron the Athenian to set up pagan worship in the temple and crush the Jewish religion (2 Macc. 6:1-11). After all, the supposed revolt of the Jews had long since been dealt with.

A number of suggestions have been made over the years, some of them to be rejected outright with others rather better but none wholly satisfactory. This religious suppression was unprecedented in antiquity. Religious intolerance has historically been a practice of monotheistic religions. While Judaism itself was often seen by the Greeks and Romans as intolerant, polytheism is tolerant by its very nature. Antiochus was no religious zealot. He had no occasion to suppress Judaism for ideological reasons, while Jews outside Palestine itself and even in the very capital of Antioch carried on with their worship without hindrance. This has led some to see Menelaus as the instigator. The problem is that Menelaus was also apparently no ideologue but purely a power seeker. We are left to rack our brains over this conundrum.

Although a number of suggestions have been made about the causes of the Maccabean Revolt, the chief and primary cause remains the religious suppression. The high priest was not of the traditional priestly family, and some argued that he had even committed sacrilegious acts. Their temple had been taken over by a pagan cult. The Jews of Palestine were being prevented from exercising their ancestral religion, sometimes by violent means. Although the Jews had docilely accepted foreign rule for centuries, it is hardly surprising that some of them now revolted against the Seleucid overlordship.

It may well be that the initial revolt was not instigated by the Maccabean family and that they joined it only later. Nevertheless, they assumed control at a fairly early stage, under the leadership of Judas. The Jews had some remarkable military successes against the Seleucid armies, but none was miraculous: all can be explained by normal military actions. By the time of Antiochus IV's death in 164 BCE Judas and his forces had retaken the temple area and had it cleansed and the

regular service resumed (I argue that it was a year earlier, in 165 BCE). Yet the main Seleucid defense of Jerusalem was the Akra, and this remained in Syrian hands.

Making use of the letters of 2 Maccabees 11, the order of events seems to be that Menelaus, realizing the situation, went to Antiochus IV and asked for an end to the religious measures. Antiochus conceded, on grounds that hostilities by the Jews also cease (Antiochus IV to the Jews: 11:27-33). About the same time, Lysias was negotiating with Jewish representatives. As a result he broke off his first engagement so that the Jews would have time to cease from hostilities and accept the new grant of religious freedom (11:16-21). The Romans, being apprised of this, also indicated their own opinion by a letter to the Jews (11:34-38). For over a year (autumn 165 to spring 163) the Syrians left Judea alone. Yet Judas's group had refused to cooperate, not only retaking the temple area but also besieging the Seleucid garrison in the Akra.

Since the hostilities had not come to an end, Lysias found it necessary to invade once more (spring 163) and inflict a decisive defeat on Judas. But events in Antioch prevented his following up that victory, and he negotiated with those besieged in the temple. The reason was a problem in his own backyard: the general Philip, who had been given authority by Antiochus IV on his deathbed, attempted a coup in Antioch (1 Macc. 6:55-63; 2 Macc. 13:23-24). Lysias's basic concession was to confirm the freedom of the Jews to practice their traditional religion. Although this had already been done earlier, it was important to provide further guarantees. At this time, probably on his way back from Judea, he had Menelaus executed. The exact reason is not made clear, but it was likely due to the realization that no peace with the Jews would be possible as long as Menelaus continued to hold the office of high priest (*Ant*. 12.9.7 §§383-5). After the execution, Alcimus was appointed to take Menelaus's place (cf. 1 Macc. 7:5; 2 Macc. 14:3-13). Finally, once Antiochus V was securely on the throne (but under Lysias's guardianship), he wrote confirming the concessions (Antiochus V to Lysias: 11:22-26 [if it is genuine]). Because the Seleucids seemed willing to return to the status quo, that could have ended the Jewish revolt.

4. Maccabean fight for an independent Jewish state

The Maccabees, however, had changed their goals: they were no longer satisfied just with the right to practice their religion; now, they wanted complete independence from Seleucid rule. They therefore continued the fight. Yet whereas it appears that the Jews as a whole had been behind them during the religious revolt, most were now willing to accept the Seleucid offer of peace and return to their normal lives. The Maccabees became only a small minority, often apparently little more than a guerrilla band. The high priest Menelaus had been executed under Antiochus V and had been replaced by Alcimus (2 Macc. 14:3-13). The Jews as a whole seem to have accepted Alcimus as a legitimate high priest. All of this left the Maccabees out in the cold.

Judas Maccabeus was killed fighting the Seleucid army about 162 BCE, and his place as leader was taken by his brother Jonathan. But then the high priest

Alcimus died about 160 BCE. What we do not know is whether anyone was appointed high priest in his place. There has been much speculation about this, but no clear appointment can thus far be found in the sources. There is no reason to assume that a hiatus in the high priesthood would not have been allowed. The temple could function routinely on the cultic level without a serving high priest. (The one problem would be the ceremonies on the Day of Atonement [Leviticus 16]).

After a period of further fighting, Jonathan negotiated a truce with the Seleucids, which left him with free rein to begin establishing his dominance and to get back at his Jewish opponents. The apparent lack of a new high priest meant that a power vacuum now existed in the Jewish leadership. The real opportunity for the Maccabees came some years later about 153 BCE when a rival dynasty arose and set out to capture the Seleucid throne. With rivals for the Seleucid crown, there was now a chance for Jonathan to play one against the other, getting concessions from both sides and then choosing the one that seemed to be most advantageous.

The Seleucid concessions allowed Jonathan to establish his headquarters in Jerusalem with Seleucid authority. It is important to note that, contrary to the impression given by 1 Maccabees, this seems to be the first time that Jonathan's authority was widely accepted by Jews, and the reason was the official royal backing. One of the concessions made to Jonathan was to give him the title of high priest, along with the purple robe and gold crown which accompanied it according to Seleucid tradition. Jonathan donned these at the Feast of Tabernacles (c. 153 BCE), thus formally beginning the tradition of the Hasmonean high priesthood. The Maccabees had now established their leadership, but control was not all in Jonathan's hands. At least two references from a slightly later time (1 Macc 12:6, 35) show that he was assisted—and constrained—by a council of elders which was probably a continuation of the old council of elders or *gerousia*. Also, opposition from some Jews continued.

Jonathan's game of playing the Seleucid rivals to the throne against one another eventually came to a bad end. The guardian of one of the pretenders was a Seleucid named Tryphon. He got Jonathan to enter the city of Ptolemais and then took him prisoner. After a time he put him to death, and the Jewish leadership fell on his brother Simon. Simon was now the last of the Maccabean brothers alive and the third to become leader of the Hasmonean movement. By now the majority of the Palestinian Jews seem to have accepted the Hasmoneans as leaders.

Simon continued Jonathan's policy of playing one Seleucid rival against the other. However, Tryphon's murder of Jonathan meant that Simon would not negotiate with him, but his rival Demetrius II made a variety of far-reaching concessions, even including permission to mint his own coinage. The writer of 1 Maccabees could now claim that in the 1st year of Simon—the 170th year of the Seleucid era (143–142 BCE)—"the yoke of the Gentiles was lifted from Israel" (13:41-42). Judah was now an independent state.

There is no doubt that this was a significant date and event since Judah had been a vassal state of one sort or another since the time of Tiglath-pileser III

(about 736 BCE). Subsequent events were to show that this status of "liberation" was short-lived and that Simon himself died violently as had all his brothers. Nevertheless, as a psychological high point the formal proclamation of liberty should be given its due. Indeed, for a time the Judeans dated their contracts and legal documents from Simon's first year. His reign is thus summarized (1 Macc. 14:4-15, NEB):

> As long as Simon lived, Judaea was at peace. He promoted his people's welfare, and they lived happily all through the glorious days of his reign … They farmed their land in peace, and the land produced its crops, and the trees in the plains their fruit. Old men sat in the streets, talking together of their blessings … He restored peace to the land, and there were great rejoicings throughout Israel. Each man sat under his own vine and fig-tree, and they had no one to fear.

In Simon's third year, a stela was erected which recounted his and his brothers' deeds and confirmed him in the office of high priest (1 Macc. 14:27-47). Yet this stela itself has an interesting message when read carefully. The fact that his powers had to be officially granted, including his high priestly authority, indicates many were not willing to accept these as yet. Also, they were apparently negotiated with various power groups, which is why they were declared only in his third year.

5. Hasmonean state

Simon Maccabee himself died violently, at the hands of a Jewish rival, and was succeeded in the office of high priest and leader of the Jews by his son John Hyrcanus (Hyrcanus I: c. 135–104 BCE). Although Judah had become independent in theory under Simon, the Seleucids continued to dominate the Jewish state off and on for a time. But Hyrcanus was eventually successful in becoming free of Seleucid control. Again, this was partly achieved by playing off the rivals for the Seleucid throne against one another. He took the opportunity to expand his territory; his most significant acts included the capture of Shechem and Samaria and the forcible conversion of the inhabitants of Idumea to Judaism. Forced conversion is generally not very successful, yet the Idumeans evidently remained Jewish and were one of the few who helped the Jews when the Romans besieged Jerusalem in the 66–70 war.

Opposition developed under Hyrcanus's high priesthood, and he had to spend some time putting down rebels. Exactly what form this rebellion took or when is unclear. In the *War* Josephus refers simply to some of Hyrcanus's "countrymen" (*epichōriōn* [1.2.8 §67]). In the *Antiquities* he makes the opponents Pharisees, stating that Hyrcanus had himself been a Pharisee but, after falling out with them, became a Sadducee (13.10.5–7 §§288–99). In any event, he soon reduced the opposition and spent the rest of his reign peacefully, dying a natural death after a rule of thirty-one years.

Regardless of who Hyrcanus's opponents were, it is under Hasmonean rule that we first hear about the major Jewish sects—Sadducees, Pharisees, and

Essenes—which tend to dominate religious discussions for this period. While the roots of some of these may lie much earlier, Josephus does not mention them until this point in his accounts. Some, such as the Qumran group, regarded the temple at Jerusalem as polluted and the current priesthood as illegitimate. Others seem to have accepted the priestly establishment without being all that interested in it, at least as far as their major religious discussions were concerned (e.g. the Pharisees). Eventually some groups came to reject the temple all together, though whether this is true of any in pre-Roman times is a question. All in all, the sects served as agents of change and development in Judaism, with far-reaching consequences in one or two cases.

Hyrcanus's son Aristobulus I (104–103 BCE) became high priest briefly. Although we know little about his short rule, he is alleged to have done several important things: (a) he was the first to actually take the title of king, previous Hasmonean high priests having acted as rulers but not having used the actual title; (b) he had the title *Philhellene*, which suggests that he contributed to certain building projects in Greek cities; (c) he took the area of Iturea (in southern Lebanon) and required the inhabitants to adopt circumcision and live according to Jewish law.

Alexander Janneus (103–76 BCE) was Aristobulus I's brother. Most of what we learn about Alexander's reign is devoted to two issues: further expansion of territory and the internal Jewish opposition to his rule. He made a treaty with Cleopatra III of Egypt and added several coastal cities to his territory. At this point in his reign a revolt developed. It began at the Feast of Tabernacles when he was pelted with citrons while sacrificing in his capacity as high priest. The exact reasons for this opposition are not clear. The climax came when his opponents called in Demetrius III of Damascus (one of the Seleucid rivals at this time) against him (c. 88 BCE). Large numbers of Jews fought on both sides in the ensuing engagement. Demetrius seems to have got the better of the contest, and drove Alexander from the battlefield. However, when those who had asked Demetrius's aid now abandoned him and a large number of Jews rallied to Alexander, Demetrius had little choice but to retire from the country. Alexander brought the revolt to a close by having 800 of the men crucified and their families slaughtered before their eyes, while he and his concubines feasted and watched the spectacle. The incident also seems to be referred to in the Qumran commentary on Nahum 2:12 (4QpNah 1.6-7, Vermes's translation):

> Interpreted, this concerns the furious young lion [who executes revenge] on those who seek smooth things and hangs men alive, [a thing never done] formerly in Israel.

Alexander Janneus died at the age of forty-nine, after reigning twenty-seven years. At this point in the narrative, there is a significant difference between Josephus's two accounts. The *Antiquities* claims that before his death, Alexander advised his wife Alexandra Salome to make peace with the Pharisees, grant them a certain amount of power, and pretend to have disapproved of her husband's activities.

The result was that they gave the king a magnificent funeral with many eulogies. This has led some scholars to infer that most of the opponents of Alexander were Pharisees. Against this are several considerations: (1) the *War* not only makes no mention of this death-bed incident but makes no mention of the Pharisees at all during Alexander's reign; (2) despite this conclusion to his account in the *Antiquities*, Josephus himself does not otherwise mention the Pharisees during Alexander's reign; indeed, he at no point suggests that those who opposed, fought, and were killed by Alexander were specificially Pharisees. Therefore, one can only conclude that Pharisaic opponents—which most probably existed—were only a part of the opposition against him. One also suspects that the death-bed scene with regard to the Pharisees was an invention by Josephus to explain the influence of the Pharisees over Alexandra Salome during her rule.

Alexandra Salome (76–67 BCE), the wife of Janneus, ruled in his place. The one feature which stands out in both of Josephus's accounts is the extent to which the Pharisees dominated the reign of Alexandra. In much later rabbinic literature there were still preserved traditions of the reign of Alexandra as a golden age (e.g. *b. Taan*. 23a). Although the *Antiquities* says that Alexandra "restored" (*apokatestēsen*) the Pharisaic regulations which John Hyrcanus had abolished (13. l6.2 §408), the *War* knows nothing of this. As already noted, there is reason to question the extent of Pharisaic influence in Alexander's time, and the ability of the Pharisees to impose their own regulations as law probably originated under Alexandra, as Josephus's earlier account seems to indicate (*War* 1.5.2 §110). On the other hand, the Pharisees clearly possessed considerable political clout under Alexandra, including the ability to get rid of a number of their enemies. It finally reached the stage that some eminent citizens appealed directly to Alexandra (with the aid of her son Aristobulus) for a guarantee of safety. To appease them she allowed some of the importuners to guard certain of her fortresses.

6. Coming of Rome

When Alexandra died, there was a context between her two sons, Aristobulus II and Hyrcanus II (67–63 BCE). Eventually, they appealed to the Roman legate Pompey who had come to the Syrian region to fight the Armenians. Although Aristobulus bowed to Pompey's authority, his followers had a different idea and shut the city of Jerusalem against the Romans. The Romans took the city after three months. Pompey and others of the Romans entered the temple area and even went inside the Holy of Holies, but the temple itself was respected: neither the vessels nor the temple treasure was touched, and the temple itself was cleansed and the cult resumed the next day at Pompey's command. Thus, Judea as an independent kingdom came to an end. Although it was to be a vassal kingdom of Rome for many years under Herod the Great and Agrippa I, it was not again to be a sovereign nation for another two millennia.

Conclusions

We can summarize by first pointing out that apocalyptic is a complex phenomenon, a sub-division of—or at least closely related to—prophecy and mantic wisdom. Our knowledge of apocalyptic comes not only from writings that are formally apocalypses (however one defines that) but from a range of literary forms and social situations. It can arise in a variety of contexts, though we know that some apocalyptic works arose out of traumatic events and millenarian movements. We have several apocalypses or related works that seem to have originated because of events or situations under Hasmonean dominance, including the *Animal Apocalypse* (*1 Enoch* 85–90) and Daniel 7–12 (some would also put the *Apocalypse of Weeks* [*1 Enoch* 93:1-10; 91:11-17] here). This study has identified six "turning points" that each might be a backdrop for apocalyptic writings:

1. Hellenization. Greek culture does not seem to have been a major problem for the Jews. Yet in addition to their own apocalyptic tradition that seems to have arisen in the Persian period, they might well have come in contact with apocalyptic or related writings from Mesopotamia, Persia, or Egypt. It is likely that the *Book of Watchers* (*1 Enoch* 1–36) originated in the early Hellenistic period.
2. Dispute over the high priesthood. The clash between members of the high priestly family may have worried some Jews, though the "Hellenistic reform" seems to have been widely welcomed at the time.
3. Attempted suppression of Judaism and the Maccabean Revolt. This was definitely a traumatic period for most inhabitants of Judah. The cessation of the *tamid* offering was seen by many as shaking the cosmic order to its foundations. Daniel 7–12 dates from this time, evidently before the retaking of the temple. The *Animal Apocalypse* (*1 Enoch* 85–90) was also composed at this time, or at least an earlier composition was updated. Some would also date the *Apocalypse of Weeks* (*1 En* 93:1-10; 91:11-17) to this period.
4. Fight for independence. The period following the Seleucid offer of peace and the status quo, when only the Maccabees continued to fight, would have been an ordeal for them, though probably not for most other Jews. But it is possible that the *Animal Apocalypse* was completed during this period, though while Judas was evidently still alive.
5. Hasmonean rule. There was considerable internal opposition to the Hasmoneans at times. The temple and its priesthood were seen as polluted by some groups. This could easily be the background of some apocalypses, though whether any survived is a question.
6. Roman rule. Although strictly "post-Hasmonean," this created hardship for many Jews, not just psychologically to be under foreign rule again, but also physically for those uprooted from conquered territories and resettled back in Judah proper. The *Psalms of Solomon* (or at least some of them) seem to have their origin in this period.

3

Non-Apocalyptic Responses to Apocalyptic Events: Notes on the Sociology of Apocalypticism

Gabriele Boccaccini, University of Michigan

1. Apocalyptic texts and apocalyptic events

The writing of Second Temple apocalyptic texts is often explicitly associated with the experience of particularly catastrophic (or "apocalyptic") events, such as the Maccabean Revolt(s), the Roman conquest in 63 BCE, and, finally, the two Jewish rebellions in 66–70 and 135 CE. This connection has generated an established tradition in scholarship that reads the origin and development of apocalypticism as a direct consequence of "apocalyptic" events, when Israel suddenly found itself at the center of traumatic international conflicts.

The Hasmonean period was certainly an age of war and struggle. Before its conclusion with the Roman conquest, it started and (almost) ended with two catastrophic international events: the Maccabean Revolt(s), and the invasion of the Armenian King Tigranes II at the time of Queen Salome Alexandra.

In the case of the Maccabean Revolt, we have indeed the production of a series of apocalyptic documents, like the Enochic *Book of Dream Visions* and the Book of Daniel, which interpreted the crisis in apocalyptic terms. From the Hasmonean period, however, come also two important texts, which interpreted historical events in non-apocalyptic terms (the First Book of Maccabees and the Book of Judith), and another non-apocalytic narrative (2 Maccabees) that contains some significant apocalyptic elements.

2. 1 Maccabees

The First Book of Maccabees opens with the (quasi-apocalyptic) description of a dramatic historical event that affected the entire world—the conquest of Alexander the Great (Ch. 1). The drama is emphasized by the perception that the Jewish society was divided—the presence of some "renegades" transformed

that international event into a menace for the survival of "Judaism" (at least in the form the author supported), with the coming of the "arrogant" King Antiochus Epiphanes. Nonetheless no substantial apocalyptic element follows in the narrative of 1 Maccabees. From the author's perspective, the success of the enemies depends exclusively on the sins of Israel, who abandoned the Mosaic Torah, and has no cosmic implications.

There is no surprise and no pity in the text. The sinful generation is doomed to total destruction because of their sins, until a new righteous generation would arise under the leadership of the Maccabees (Ch. 2). A "new" righteous leadership also supersedes the "old" sinful leadership. By repeating the deeds of Phineas, Mattathias earns God's favor and through their fight, his children restore the righteousness and independence of Israel. The covenant of Phineas, which was the foundation of the authority of the High Priesthood of the House of Zadok, is superseded by the new covenant with the House of Hasmoneus.

The climax of 1 Maccabees is the final eulogy of Simon (Ch. 14), which once again echoes some apocalyptic themes (peace of the land, defeat of the evildoers, etc.) in terms of fulfilled eschatology: "The land had rest all the days of Simon." More relevant is the parallelism with the eulogy of the Zadokite High Priest "Simon son of Onias" in the Book of Sirach (Ch. 50), which highlights the continuity between the Zadokite and the Maccabean ideology. The Hebrew Sirach had ended with the reference to the covenant of Phineas that promised God's eternal support to the ruling priesthood ("May [God] keep in him the covenant of Phineas; may one never be cut off from him, and as for his offspring, (may it be) as the days of heaven"). The divine promise has not failed; it has simply shifted to the Hasmoneans as the "new" offspring of Phineas.

It is in fact with Simon that the new dynasty is finally established, when his son John Hyrcanus succeeded him as high priest and king. 1 Maccabees concludes in a manner similar to the ancient accounts of the kings of Israel: "The rest of the acts of John and his wars and the brave deeds that he did, and the building of the walls that he completed and his achievements are written in the annals of his high priesthood, from the time that he became high priests after his father" (1 Macc 16:23-24; cp. 1 Kings 11:41; 2 Kings 10:34; 12:19; 20:20; *passim*). The anti-climactic conclusion wants to convene a sense of accomplishment and "normality" after the turmoil of the Maccabean period. The crisis is over and a new dynasty of "sons of Phineas" has successfully replaced the Zadokite priesthood, from father to son.

3. The Book of Judith

The Book of Judith also begins with the (quasi-apocalyptic) description of the invasion of an "arrogant" King, who conquers the world and moves against Jerusalem and the sanctuary (Chs. 1–3). The name of the "Nebuchadnezzar of Assiria" is not revealed, even though his military campaign follows step after step the military campaign of the Armenian King Tigranes the Great, who

in 69 BCE besieged Ptolemais and came to threaten Israel (see Rocca, Ilan, Boccaccini).

Contrary to 1 Maccabees, the Book of Judith does not describe "Israel" as a divided "sinful" people, but as a "righteous" people that "after the exile" is now united behind its religious and political leaders.

> When they departed from the way [God] prescribed for them, they were utterly defeated … [and] the temple was razed to the ground … But now they have returned to their God and have come back from the places where they were scattered. (4:17-19)

Facing such a powerful enemy, many Jews are nonetheless discouraged and on the verge of surrender. They are aware that the success of the enemies depends exclusively on the sin of Israel ("If they are not a guilty nation … their Lord and God will defend them" 4:21). The success of the enemy, however, seems to contradict God's promises to his righteous people.

At the end it is the righteousness of the pious widow Judith (or Queen Salome Alexandra) who saved the day and restored the peace and prosperity of the Jewish people. Her unshaken leadership, and divine intervention (in reality, the coming of the Roman general Lucullus) forced the powerful enemy to withdraw.

The climax of the book is the song-eulogy of Judith (Salome Alexandra) (Ch. 16), which once again echoes apocalyptic themes (peace of the land, defeat of the enemies) in terms of fulfilled eschatology. The song plays in the text the same function as in Sirach and 1 Maccabees; it certifies God's support to the ruling dynasty.

Like 1 Maccabees, the Book of Judith also has a similar anti-climactic conclusion, with the death and funeral of Judith. Once again, the text aims to deliver a sense of accomplishment and normality. Peace and prosperity are given to the dynasty: "No one ever again spread terror among the Israelites during the lifetime of Judith, or for a long time after her death" (16:25). Obviously, the author could not know that soon the Roman intervention would put an end to the Hasmonean power.

4. The Enochic apocalyptic tradition

When we compare the First Book of Maccabees and the Book of Judith with other texts from the Hasmonean period, it is immediately apparent that the same events could be reinterpreted in apocalyptic terms, although with different nuances.

The most radical reaction is that given by the Enochic tradition (and later by the sectarian literature of Qumran). In Dream Visions the Maccabean crisis is a consequence of the action of demonic forces that rebelled against God. The rebellion started in Heaven in primeval times, long before the coming of Alexander the Great.

Humans were created as "snow-white cows" (1 En 85:3), but then

> a star fell down from heaven and managed to rise and eat and to be pastured among those cows … many stars descended and cast themselves down from the sky upon that first star, and they became bovids among those calves and were pastured together with them. (1 En 86:1–2)

The angelic sin of trespassing and mingling is the origin of what the vision presents like the spread of a genetic disease that changed the nature of humankind, subsequently producing inferior species of animals.

> I kept observing, and behold, I saw all of them extending their sexual organs like horses and commencing to mount upon the heifers, the bovids; and [the latter] all became pregnant and bore elephants, camels, and donkeys. (1 En 86:4)

Neither the intervention of the good angels, who reduce the rebels to impotence (1 En 87–88), nor the flood (see 1 En 89:2-8) can eradicate evil from the earth. Evil descendants are bound to arise, even from the holy survivors. From Noah, "the snow-white cow which became a man" (i.e. like the angels), are born "three cows," but

> one of those three cows was snow-white, similar to that [first] cow [Shem], and one red like blood [Japheth], and one black [Ham] … They began to bear the beasts of the fields and the birds. There arose out of them many [different] species. (1 En 89:9-10)

History witnesses a continuous expansion of evil, with no way for human beings to oppose its spread. Nobody is spared: in the metaphorical world of the *Animal Apocalypse*, even the Jews, who are the noblest part of humankind, bear the evil gene of degeneration; by the generation of Jacob, from "cows" they have become "sheep."

> [Abraham] the snow-white cow which was born in their midst begat a wild ass [Ishmael], and a snow-white cow with it [Isaac]; and the wild asses multiplied. And that cow which was born from him bore a black wild boar [Esau] and a snow-white sheep [Jacob]; the former then bore many wild boars and the latter bore twelve sheep. (1 En 89:11-12)

After the Babylonian exile the situation collapses; God entrusts his people to "seventy shepherds" (the angels of the nations), who show themselves to be rebellious, trespassing upon their assigned tasks in such a way that the entire institutions of Israel (including the sanctuary and the priesthood) are corrupted under demonic influence.

The result is a strong self-perception of being powerless victims of evil, until some "sheep" will open their eyes and the elect begin fighting against their oppressors (90:1-12). Then God himself will put an end to this evil world in the world to come; the time of God's vengeance has finally come (90:15).

5. Daniel: The merger of apocalyptic and Deuteronomistic tradition

Daniel has been often—and sometimes improperly—associated to Dream Visions. The two documents are very nearly contemporary, both being dated to the first years of the Maccabean Revolt, between the murder of Onias III, the last legitimate Zadokite high priest (170 BCE), and the death of Antiochus Epiphanes (164 BCE). Both documents are apocalyptic; they share the same literary genre (apocalypse) and the same worldview (apocalypticism), and—which is even more significant—substantially address the same questions. Yet, a comparison between Daniel and the *Book of Dream Visions* (1 En 83-90) shows that the two apocalyptic documents cannot be ascribed to a single movement or party. As John J. Collins also pointed out, the Jewish apocalypses "were not produced by a single apocalyptic movement but constituted a genre that could be utilized by different groups in various situations." The apocalyptic Daniel is a non-Enochic (or even anti-Enochic) apocalyptic document.

Daniel also answers the call for an explanation of the origin of evil, and it does so not referring to the Enochic myth of the fallen angels but recalling a foundational text of the Zadokite tradition and a foundational concept of Zadokite covenantal theology: "the curse and the oath which are written in the law of Moses" against those who would break the covenant (Lev. 26:3-45; cf. Deut. 28:15-68; Exod. 24:3-8).

According to Leviticus 26, "peace in the land" is one of the blessings of the covenant (Lev. 26:3-13), but "if you will not obey me … I will set my face against you, and you shall be struck down by your enemies; your foes shall rule over you" (26:14-17). The length of the punishment is subordinated to Israel's repentance: "If in spite of these punishments you have not turned back to me, but continue hostile to me, then I too will continue hostile to you: I myself will strike you sevenfold for your sins" (Lev. 26:23-24; cf. 26:18, 21, 27-28). This is exactly what happened according to Daniel. Israel "broke the covenant" (Lev 26:15) and was punished by God with seventy years of exile, as announced by the prophet Jeremiah, but then Israel in spite of this did not turn back to God but continued hostile. As a result, God multiplied the punishment "sevenfold" and the seventy years became "seventy weeks of years" (Dan. 9:24). God's punishment will culminate in the coming, in the last week, of a king (Antiochus Epiphanes), who "shall make a strong covenant with many for one week, and for half of the week shall cause sacrifice and offering to cease; and the desolating abomination will be in their place, until the decreed destruction is poured out upon the desolator" (Dan. 9:26-27).

As in Dream Visions, the resolution will come only with the end of times in the world to come, but in Daniel we do not have the same emphasis on the victimization of Israel. It is the people who bore the collective responsibility of the crisis, even though the righteous individuals are not doomed, as in 1 Maccabees. They suffer the punishment God unleashed against a sinful generation, yet they are expected to remain faithful to the covenant and even pay the price for their righteousness through martyrdom. The genius of Daniel is in separating collective and

individual retribution. At the end of times, the heroic and faithful resistance of the martyrs will have a reward through the resurrection (Ch. 12).

6. 2 Maccabees

2 Maccabees is not an apocalypse, yet we find in the text some apocalyptic elements (especially the notion of the end of time and the resurrection of the righteous) and an attitude that is strikingly similar to Daniel. The author of 2 Maccabees can also be defined as a disenchanted supporter of the Maccabean Revolt. Where 1 Maccabees celebrated the glories of the Hasmonean dynasty until John Hyrcanus, in 2 Maccabees Judas is exalted only as the head of the Hasidim (2 Macc. 8:5). The protagonist of the book is rather the people and its heroic fidelity to the Torah. With Daniel (vs Dream Visions), 2 Maccabees shares a positive view of the Second Temple, although the Zadokite priesthood now belongs to an idealized past no longer present, when "the holy city was inhabited in unbroken peace and the laws were strictly observed because of the piety of the high priest Onias and his hatred of wickedness" (2 Macc. 3:1).

Like Daniel, 2 Maccabees rejects the "apocalyptic-Henochic" idea of a super-human origin of evil. The origin of any suffering endured by the righteous is the sin of Israel: "It is no light thing to show irreverence to the divine laws" (2 Macc. 4.17). At the center of 2 Maccabees, even more clearly than in Daniel, is the problem of the suffering of the righteous, who are driven to the supreme test of martyrdom. The answer is similar: the distinction between collective and individual retribution.

The idea of the resurrection keeps alive the fear of divine punishment even when God appears to have already put in place and exhausted his intervention in this world. It is the consciousness of the divine judgement after death that pushes the old Eleazar to refuse the possibility of any subterfuge to avoid martyrdom: "Even if for the present I would avoid the punishment of mortals, yet whether I live or die I will not escape the hands of the Almighty" (2 Macc. 6:26).

The idea of resurrection gives meaning to the martyrs' willingness to renounce the blessings promised by the covenant in this world, in the hope of a greater reward in the world to come. Seven brothers and their mother bravely face martyrdom trusting that "the king of the universe will raise us up to an everlasting renewal of life, because we have died for his laws" (2 Macc. 7:9, cf. 7.23: "the Creator of the world … will in his mercy give [us] back life and breath"). An abyss of death and destruction instead awaits the persecutor—more terrible than any apparent and ephemeral success in this world: "For you, instead, there will be no resurrection to life" (2 Macc. 7:14).

In the hope of resurrection, even suicide is justified, as an extreme act of martyrdom. When the guards of the king come to arrest him, the righteous Razis dies by his own will, "invoking the Lord of life and spirit to give them back to him again" (2 Macc. 14:37-46).

The idea of resurrection finally includes also the possibility for the individual to

receive intercession after death. The idea of Judas Maccabeus to offer a sacrifice of atonement for the fallen in battle is clearly enhanced by the author as "a good and noble initiative, suggested by the thought of the resurrection" (2 Macc. 12:38-45).

Through these examples, 2 Maccabees shows that faithfulness to the covenant retains all its validity for the individual even when he/she is involved in the punishment of God against an unfaithful generation. Indeed, according to 2 Maccabees, as injustice has many tragic consequences on the individual, the righteousness of the individual has beneficial effects on the many. The martyrs willingly accept to share the collective punishment, recognizing the fairness of God's justice, while at the same time contribute with their sacrifice to the restoration of better relations between God and his people. The prayer of one of the seven brothers, while recognizing that "we are suffering because of our own sins," expresses the hope that "through me and my brothers we can bring to an end the wrath of the Almighty, that has justly fallen on our whole nation" (2 Macc. 7:32, 38).

Compared to Daniel, however, 2 Maccabees attenuates the drama of the Maccabean crisis: it is not the beginning of the end times, but only a parenthesis, "a short time," in the history of the relations between God and his people. "If our living Lord is angry for a little while, to rebuke and discipline us, he will again be reconciled with his own servants" (2 Macc 7:33, cf. 5:17). After any "misfortunes and abandonment" follows "the reconciliation with the Great King" (2 Macc. 5:20).

The fundamental text is 2 Maccabees 6:12-17, which also in its literary form is presented as a meditative parenthesis for the reader, that clarifies the meaning of the narrative: "I urge those who read this book not to be depressed by such calamities" (2 Macc. 6:12). The punishment is fair, yet "the punishments are not for destruction, but to discipline our people" (2 Macc. 6:12). Indeed, the fact that Jews are punished immediately for their sins is "a sign of great kindness", while "the other nations" are punished "when they have reached the full measure of their sins" (2 Macc. 6:13–14). Despite the horror of the persecution and the hardness of the test, the theology that the author learned from Daniel gives him the opportunity to offer a message of consolation and hope. "Although [God] disciplines us with calamities, he does not forsake his own people" (2 Macc. 6:16).

7. Conclusion. Apocalypticism: Psychological trauma or social protest?

1 Maccabees and Judith demonstrate that the Hasmonean ruling class could read even the most catastrophic events, such as the Maccabean Revolt and the Tigranes invasion, within the non-apocalyptic boundaries of Deuteronomistic theology. From their perspective both these events had a positive resolution; at the end the Jewish people was (miraculously, against any hope) spared from the attack of foreign nations and regained its independence. Even more significantly, these events were evidence of the righteousness of the Hasmoneans and as such had a foundational role in the consolidation of their leadership as granted by God's will.

Apocalyptic elements are present, in different degrees, in other literature of the time, in texts such as Dream Visions, Daniel, and 2 Maccabees. It cannot be accidental that while non-apocalytic texts, such as 1 Maccabees and Judith, were the product of authors who supported the Hasmonean dynasty, all (more or less) apocalyptic texts express a point of view of people who did not like or (at least) had strong reservations against the Hasmonean dynasty. The Enochic tradition rejects any legitimacy of the Second Temple priesthood and sees in the (Jewish) ruling classes the earthly instrument of demonic forces, before the emergence of the righteous eschatological leadership in the world to come.

Daniel and 2 Maccabees are far less radical and look with some sympathy at the righteousness of the Maccabees. The creative merger of apocalyptic and Deuteronomistic traditions reminds us that a vast range of intermediate positions were also possible. They exalted the martyrs over the fighters, advocating passive resistance more than insurgency, and emphasizing God's role in bringing the end. 2 Maccabees does not even mention the successors of Judas, nor does openly support the Hasmonean dynastic claim for power.

The general rule does not seem to admit exceptions; the degree of apocalyticism of a text is inversely proportional to its support to the Hasmoneans—the more a text supports the Hasmonean dynasty the less apocalyptic it is.

The apocalyptic worldview is not a "natural" traumatic reaction to external catastrophe (like the invasion of foreign nations) nor it affected equally the diverse social strata of the Jewish society.

More than the mark of a trauma caused by outsiders, the development of apocalyptic ideas is the symptom of social conflicts that predated the crisis. It has more to do with the social status of the authors within the Jewish society than with the historical drama in itself. In other words, there is nothing like an "apocalyptic" event, there are only social reasons that made some people react to dramatic historical events in apocalyptic terms. Social tensions produced apocalyptic-minded people who interpreted "apocalyptically" historical events.

There is something radically flow in searching for "apocalyptic" events in order to explain the rise of "apocalyptic" groups. For instance, the often-repeated assumption that the rise of Enochic Judaism must have been caused by "the Diadochoi's military struggle for political control of Palestine" (Nickelsburg 2001: 63) has no solid theoretical foundations. If some allusions to the Diadochi struggle are indeed present in some strata of the early Enochic texts, the problem is to understand what had previously happened within the Jewish society to provoke an apocalyptic interpretation of such events. The rise of apocalyptic groups and apocalyptic thought has much more to do with the internal dynamics of Jewish society—events that are much more difficult to detect, like changes and conflict in the structure of the priesthood, or in the degree of exploitation of the peasants, or in the balance of power among social groups.

The fact that the invasion of Tigranes did not generate apocalyptic responses (which were instead numerous in the case of the Maccabean Revolt) shows that, paradoxically, the most destructive events have less chances to generate apocalyptic responses. When a (divided) society is threatened by a common catastrophe,

social differences are (at least momentarily) annulled, as the diverse social groups tend to unite for survival. Tigranes' policy of total depredation, deportation, and religious intolerance was such an oppressive and undifferentiated menace to the entire Jewish society that it did not produce any internal social division, contrary to what happened with the Maccabean Revolt where the Seleucids could count on the support of significant strata of the Jewish upper class.

When Nickelsburg states that "eschatology is out of place in societies where changes are possible by and in behalf of the oppressed" (2012: 5), he is certainly correct, but the picture is more complex. Within the same society different groups may have different perceptions of the possibility of change. Apocalypticism gives voice to the frustrations of marginalized group, while the ruling class finds self-legitimization in non-apocalyptic theologies. While dissident groups take seriously apocalyptic ideas to express their protest and mark their opposition to the ruling class, the tendency of the ruling class is to exploit apocalyptic expectations to support their own claims. In their non-apocalyptic narratives both 1 Maccabees and Judith echoed the apocalyptic framework to tame it. They prepared the path for the cynic way in which Josephus used messianic prophecies to save his own life and the Roman imperial propaganda to support Vespasian's imperial claim.

We should not seek the origin of Jewish apocalypticism in the occurrence of dramatic international events, but in (less apparent) sociological conflicts within the Jewish society. It was these internal conflicts that made some groups interpret historical events as "apocalyptic" (not the other way around, with apocalyptic events generating apocalyptic responses). At the ends it does not depend on the "nature" of the events people have to cope with; it depends on how much power different groups have (or think they have) within their own society. I would say that apocalypticism rises in societies where there are minorities who feel marginalized and powerless. It is ultimately the self-perception of their own power that leads different groups to more or less "apocalyptic" reactions to the same event. "Apocalyptic" events only exacerbate attitudes and conflicts that predate the events themselves.

Selected Bibliography

Atkinson, Kenneth (2008), "The Salome No One Knows: Long-time Ruler of a Prosperous and Peaceful Judea Mentioned in Dead Sea Scrolls," *Biblical Archaeology Review*, 34: 60–5, 72.

Boccaccini, Gabriele (1991), *Middle Judaism* (Minneapolis: Fortress).

Boccaccini, Gabriele (1998), *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).

Boccaccini, Gabriele (2002), *Roots of Rabbinic Judaism: An Intellectual History, from Ezekiel to Daniel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).

Boccaccini, Gabriele (2008), "Where Does Ben Sira Belong? The Canon, Literary Genre, Intellectual Movement, and Social Group of a Zadokite Document," in G. Xeravits (ed.), *Studies in the Book of Ben Sira* (Leiden: Brill).

Boccaccini, Gabriele (2012), "Tigranes the Great as 'Nebuchadnezzar' in the Book of Judith," in G. Xeravits (ed.), *A Pious Seductress*, 55–69 (Leiden: Brill).
Collins, John J. (1984), *The Apocalyptic Imagination* (New York: Crossroad; 2nd edn Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998).
Collins, John J. (1993), *Daniel: A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press).
Ilan, Tal (2006), *Silencing the Queen: The Literary Histories of Shelamzion and Other Jewish Women* (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck).
Nickelsburg, George W. E. (2001, 2002), *1 Enoch: A Commentary*, 2 vols (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press).
Rocca, Samuele (2005), "The Book of Judith, Queen Sholomzion and King Tigranes of Armenia: A Sadducee Appraisal," in *Materia Giudaica* 10.1: 1–14.
Sacchi, Paolo (1996), *Jewish Apocalyptic and Its History* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
Sacchi, Paolo (2000), *The History of the Second Temple Period* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
Xeravits, Geza (ed.) (2007), *The Books of the Maccabees* (Leiden: Brill).
Xeravits, Geza (ed.) (2008), *Studies in the Book of Ben Sira* (Leiden: Brill).
Xeravits, Geza (ed.) (2012), *A Pious Seductress: Studies in the Book of Judith* (Leiden: Brill).

Part II

Major Papers and Responses

1

Understanding the Relationship Between the Apocalyptic Worldview and Jewish Sectarian Violence: The Case of the War Between Alexander Jannaeus and Demetrius III

Kenneth Atkinson

Understanding the social setting of apocalyptic literature is difficult due to the frequent ambiguous historical allusions in these texts, and because the sectarian affiliation of their authors is uncertain. Determining how different social groups engaged with apocalyptic thought and literature, moreover, is essential for reconstructing Second Temple Judaism. This paper seeks to help understand this complex period through an exploration of the possible historical background of select Qumran texts associated with a specific historical event, namely the Judean invasion of Demetrius III. It focuses on how specific groups engaged with apocalyptic thought to espouse violence against Hasmonean rule. The conclusion suggests that apocalyptic thought motivated some Jewish sectarian groups during the first century BCE to oppose native Jewish regimes based on the belief that they were living in the final historical age. The evidence suggests that the apocalyptic worldview was more pervasive during the first century BCE than previously recognized.

1. The invasion of Demetrius III: Summary

The Seleucid king Demetrius III (97/6–88/87 BCE), a son of Antiochus VIII Grypus, was the first Seleucid monarch to pose a threat to Alexander Jannaeus after the War of Scepters (*Ant.* 13.324–55; *War,* 1.86). His invasion of Judea was preceded and followed by a Jewish civil war, which makes it perhaps the most important historical event during the reign of Jannaeus. Josephus preserves two rather short narratives of this event and time, both of which present some major chronological problems. According to his accounts, Jannaeus brutally repressed a protest that took place during a religious festival. He then engaged in a disastrous campaign beyond the Jordan River in which he lost much of his army. Some Jews then successfully appealed to Demetrius III to invade Judea to remove him from power (*War* 1.88–95; *Ant*. 13.372–900).

The Seleucid and the Hasmonean forces met at Shechem. Jannaeus lost the battle; virtually all of his foreign mercenaries and much of his army perished. He and the survivors fled to the mountains; Judea was defenseless. Then, six thousand Jewish soldiers fighting for Demetrius III defected. Now uncertain of his army's loyalty, and outnumbered in hostile territory, Demetrius III panicked and fled Judea. According to Josephus, he returned to Seleucia and besieged his brother Philip I Philadelphus in Beroea. Phillip I called upon the Arabs and the Parthian governor Mithridates Sinaces for assistance. Demetrius III was defeated in battle. He was captured and taken to Parthia, where he died in captivity (*Ant.* 13.384–6). The exile of Demetrius III meant that he was no longer a threat to the Hasmonean state. Consequently, Jannaeus was free to eradicate his religious opponents and his political rivals.

Josephus writes that Jews continued to fight against Jannaeus following the departure of Demetrius III. Jannaeus besieged some of them in Bethoma/Bemeselis (*War* 1.97; *Ant.* 13.380). After capturing the city, he took many prisoners to Jerusalem. He crucified 800 of the rebels and slaughtered their children and wives before their eyes (*Ant.* 13.380). Josephus reports that over the next six years Jannaeus killed more than 50,000 of his own citizens. The remainder of his reign was filled with great bloodshed and nearly constant war.

Josephus never identifies the enemies of Jannaeus or what they expected to obtain by fighting with Demetrius III against their high priest and king. In his accounts, Josephus implies that many Jews were motivated to invite Demetrius III to invade because of the recent military losses of Jannaeus in the Transjordan. He writes that this great loss of life not only led to civil war, but that Demetrius III believed Judea was so weak that he could easily conquer it. In both works he emphasizes that Demetrius III was victorious in part due to the 6,000 Jewish soldiers who fought in the battle with the Seleucid army (*War* 1.95; *Ant.* 13.379). According to Josephus, Demetrius III had no choice but to abandon Judea after his great victory because these Jews defected. The *War* offers no reason for their perplexing action; the *Antiquities* claims they abandoned Demetrius III out of pity for Jannaeus. Neither account makes sense in light of the preceding and succeeding narratives, which document the cruelty of Jannaeus against his own Jewish opponents. Surely these Jews would not have been foolish enough to expect him to forgive their betrayal? His account implies that many of these Jews subsequently fought against Jannaeus again. The timing of their defection may provide a clue to understanding their political and theological motivations, and possibly what actually took place during the battle of Shechem.

2. The date of the invasion of Demetrius III

This invasion of Demetrius III is commonly dated to 88 BCE (*Ant.* 13.372–78; *War* 1.88–92).[1] The language of Josephus's account of the battle between Demetrius

1. Bevan 1902: 2.261; Ehling 2008: 244–5; Klausner 1972: 232; Schürer 1973: 1.221, 223–4; VanderKam 2004: 32.

III and Jannaeus at Shechem, however, does not exclude the possibility that it took place earlier. Unfortunately, Josephus provides only a schematic portrayal of Seleucid history, which is sparse and rather confusing (*Ant.* 13.365–71, 384–91). He fails to give us the precise location of Demetrius III at the time of his invasion of Judea, which is crucial for understanding why he decided to undertake this action at this particular time.

Damascus and Antioch were the major centers of action during the Seleucid civil wars. These cities changed hands several times. Numismatic evidence places the beginning of the reign of Demetrius III in Damascus in 97/6 BCE This date conflicts with the claim of Josephus (*Ant*. 13.370) that Ptolemy IX (Lathyrus) Soter II installed him there upon the death of Antiochus XI Epiphanes (c. 93 BC) (Hoover, Houghton, and Vesley, 2008: 306–8, 315–6). At this time, several Seleucids fought over Antioch. Antiochus X Eusebes, who took the city from Seleucus VI, managed to hold it for the year 94/3 BCE. An occupation of Antioch by Antiochus XI, which is not mentioned in any literary source, is known through his coinage minted there between 94 BCE and the autumn of 93 BCE. Coins show that Eusebes retook Antioch in 93/2 BCE and held it until 89/8 BCE, when he died fighting the Parthians (Hoover 2007: 289–90).

The political situation of the Seleucid Empire is unclear for much of this period due to the absence of literary sources (see further Ehling 2008: 231–46). Demetrius III continued to rule Damascus for much of this time. He issued coins in his name there from 97/6-88/7 BCE, with a one-year interruption in 93/2 BCE when he briefly lost the city (Hoover, Houghton, and Vesley, 2008: 306–8, 315–6). His brother, Philip I, apparently held a portion of northern Syria at Beroea and Cilicia (*Ant.* 13.384). It has been assumed that Demetrius III ruled Antioch upon the death of Eusebes in late 92 BCE, and that he held it until his capture by the Parthians in 88/7 BCE (Bellinger 1949: 75–6; Newell 1978: 117). The numismatic evidence, however, suggests that Eusebus ruled Antioch from 93/2 BCE until 89/8 BCE when Demetrius III captured the city. Numismatic evidence shows that Demetrius III managed to hold Antioch for a single year (88/7 BCE); he was forced to retreat to Damascus (Hoover 2007: 294). Phillip I took Antioch from him in that year. Philip's ally Straton called upon Azizus, the Phylarch of the Arabs, and Mithridates Sinakes, the governor of the Parthians, for help. The two came to Philip's assistance and defeated and captured Demetrius III at Beroea in 88/7 BCE.They exiled Demetrius III to Parthia where died of an illness (*Ant.* 13.384–6; Hoover 2007: 294–5; Houghton 1987: 81–2). The first coin of Antiochus XII was minted in Damascus the following year, SE 226 (=87/6 BCE). This shows that he took advantage of the capture of Demetrius III to take control of the city. He occupied Damascus until 84/3 BCE (cf. *Ant.* 13.387–91; *War* 1.99–102).

Events in Seleucia favor a date of 90/89 BCE for the invasion of Demetrius III rather than the traditional date of 88 BCE (Hoover, Houghton, and Vesley 2008: 306–7, 310.). At this time he was in control of Damascus, which coins indicate he ruled from 97/6–88/8 BCE. He was, moreover, not at war with his brother, Philip I. It was the perfect time for Demetrius III to seek to expand his territory to the south and annex Judea. According to Josephus, after he abruptly abandoned his campaign

in Judea, he moved against his brother Philip I (*Ant.* 13.379, 384; *War* 1.95–9). Demetrius III must have been operating out of Damascus, rather than Antioch, when the opponents of Jannaeus invited him to intervene and invade Judea. The city of Beroea had been Philip's base. Demetrius III attacked him there immediately after he left Judea. The decision of Demetrius III to start a war with his brother is likely due to the vacuum created by the death of Eusebes in 88/9 BCE.The numismatic evidence of Demetrius III at Damascus may help us to understand why he decided to intervene in Judean affairs, and why the opponents of Jannaeus invited him to do so. Placing his invasion in 90/89 BCE rather than 88 BCE means that it took place approximately two to three years after Demetrius III had lost and then regained control of Damascus (Hoover 2007: 290-6). It is possible that he left Damascus in 93 BCE to help his brothers, Antiochus XI and Philip I, take Antioch from Eusebes (Houghton 1998: 66–8; Houghton 1989: 97–8). During the time Demetrius III was absent, his southern enemies, either Jannaeus or the Nabatean Arabs, may have briefly occupied Damascus (Hoover, Houghton, and Vesley 2008: 315–16). This would suggest that Demetrius III did not invade Judea at the invitation of the opponents of Jannaeus, but that he possibly undertook his campaign to avenge previous Hasmonean incursions into Seleucid territory. Although Josephus suggests that Demetrius III acted somewhat impulsively, and only invaded Judea when the opponents of Jannaeus convinced him that he could easily take the nation now that it was at civil war, the numismatic evidence suggests otherwise. Mint production at Damascus rapidly rises in SE 222 (=91/0 BCE), the year Demetrius III regained control of Damascus, and continues until SE 223 (=90/89 BCE). This increased production of currency likely represents his funding for his planned attack against Jannaeus (Hoover, Houghton, and Vesley 2008: 306–7).

The enemies of Jannaeus likely played little or no role in encouraging Demetrius III to invade Judea. Rather than a massive defection of Jewish soldiers in the Seleucid army, the historical and numismatic evidence suggest that Demetrius III left Judea for political reasons: he decided to take his brother's kingdom as well as the territory of Eusebes. This suggests that the account of Josephus, in which the opponents of Jannaeus constituted a significant force in the Seleucid army, is not true. Demetrius III still had sufficient men to wage a war against his sibling, Philip I, and likely the remaining forces loyal to Eusebes as well. His abrupt departure from Judea was due to the unexpected death of Eusebes, which led Demetrius III and his sibling to fight for control of the Seleucid Empire. The enemies of Jannaeus that fought with Demetrius III were likely small in number. If we can identify the opponents of Jannaeus then we can perhaps better understand why they decided to back the invasion of Demetrius III, as well as what prompted them to support a Seleucid king's effort to end the Hasmonean monarchy.

3. The enemies of Alexander Jannaeus

Josephus never identifies the enemies of Jannaeus who opposed him and supported Demetrius III. Despite the differences in his *War* and his *Antiquities*, both books

claim that a revolt against Jannaeus occurred during a religious festival sometime prior to the invasion of Demetrius III (*War* 1.88–95; *Ant*. 13.372–9). The identification of this festival in the *Antiquities* as Tabernacles, when read in light of other Jewish texts, allows us to identify these adversaries.

The Mishnah likely preserves an account of the revolt against Jannaeus that is independent of Josephus. It describes a water ritual that took place at the altar during the Festival of Tabernacles (*m. Sukkah* 4.9). On one occasion, the high priest poured the libation over his feet and the people pelted him with their citrons. According to the Talmud, the high priest who committed this sacrilege was a Sadducee. Because there is only one recorded incident of such an event taking place, this story can only refer to Jannaeus. It shows that he further acerbated a tense situation when he publically mocked the Pharisees during a religious ceremony. It also provides some indirect support of Josephus's account of sectarian alliances: he claims that from the time of John Hyrcanus the Hasmonean were Sadducees.[2]

It is uncertain how much time intervened between the Tabernacles incident and the arrival of Demetrius III. Josephus places this uprising at different places in his narratives. In his *War*, a revolt takes place at an unspecified religious festival during which Pisidian and Cilician mercenaries kill protestors. This is followed by an expedition beyond the Jordan River, during which the Judean army is decimated. Then, another demonstration occurs that leads some Jews to summon Demetrius III (*War* 1.88–92). In the *Antiquities*, however, the expedition beyond the Jordan River follows the revolt during Tabernacles. Josephus also mentions the mercenaries, but does not describe their participation in subduing the rebellion. Another insurrection occurs, during which some Jews summon Demetrius III to invade Judea (*Ant.* 13.372–5).

Aryeh Kasher comments that the chronological order of Jannaeus's conquests in Josephus is "quite confused and inconsistent, to the point where it is at times extremely difficult to extract any kind of historical truth" (Kasher 1990: 154). Bar-Kochva, following a suggestion of Hölscher, proposes that Josephus has combined two sources (Bar-Kochva 1996: 293–4; Hölscher 1904: 15–16). Josephus, moreover, appears to have duplicated material pertaining to the campaigns of Jannaeus. He documents multiple invasions of the Transjordan. It is uncertain whether these duplications and transpositions should be attributed to Josephus or Nicolaus, or perhaps another source. A close look at the *Antiquities* suggests that the final product is the result of Josephus's careful structuring of his narrative. He groups the foreign campaigns of Jannaeus into six major sections. He intersperses between these wars accounts of two invasions—one by the then deposed Egyptian co-ruler Ptolemy Soter and the other by the Seleucid monarch Antiochus XII—and two reports of civil wars between the Ptolemies and the Seleucids. He also includes two accounts of how Jannaeus faced internal revolts against his rule. At the conclusion of each section, Jannaeus emerges stronger: he continues to wage additional wars of expansion and annex new territories to

2. *t. Sukkah* 48b; *y. Sukkah* 4:6 (VII.A–F). See further Rubenstein 1995: 123–3.

his realm. By juxtaposing these military campaigns, and placing them immediately after the War of Scepters, Josephus portrays Jannaeus as a great warrior. He not only completed his father's expansion of the Hasmonean state, but he did so despite potential threats from the Ptolemies and the Seleucids. In reality, Josephus's account of the reign of Jannaeus is a polemical composition that pays little attention to chronology (Atkinson 2011: 8–11, 12–17). The historical evidence suggests that Demetrius III was planning to attack Judea for some time. This raises the likelihood that the Tabernacles protest was timed to coincide with an already imminent invasion by Demetrius III.

The *Nahum Pesher* provides some important information concerning the opponents of Jannaeus. It confirms Josephus's account that he organized a mass crucifixion of his enemies. It also mentions Demetrius III (דמי]טריס), which clearly dates the reference to this time (Atkinson 2007: 144–51). The relevant passage reads:

1. [The interpretation of it concerns Jerusalem, which has become] a dwelling for the wicked ones of the nations. "Where the lion went to enter, the lion's cub [
2. [and no one to disturb. "The interpretation of it concerns Deme]trius, king of Greece, who sought to enter Jerusalem on the advice of the Seekers-After-Smooth-Things,
3. [but God did not give Jerusalem] into the power of the kings of Greece from Antiochus until the rise of the rulers of the Kittim; but later (the city) will be trampled
4. [and will be given into the hand of the rulers of the Kittim.] The lion tears enough for his cubs and strangles prey for his lionesses."
5. [The interpretation of it concerns Demetrius who made war] against the Lion of Wrath, would strike with his great ones and the men of his counsel
6. [but they fled before him "And he fills up] his cave [with prey] and his den with torn flesh." Its interpretation concerns the Lion of Wrath
7. [which will bring ven]genance on the Seekers-After-Smooth-Thing; he would hand men up alive. (4Q169 3–4 I, 1–7)

Because the author of the *Nahum Pesher* attributes this atrocity to a Greek (=Kittim) king named "Demetrius," and situates it between the invasion of Antiochus (IV Epiphanes) and the capture of Jerusalem by the Kittim (=Romans), this text can only refer to Demetrius III. The mention of crucifixion (hanging) has led to a nearly universal consensus that the *Nahum Pesher* describes the aftermath of the battle of Shechem when Jannaeus crucified 800 of his opponents who had sided with Demetrius III. Because these references are so detailed, and only fit the reign of Jannaeus, he is widely identified as the "Lion of Wrath (Amusin 1977: 123–52; Berrin 2004: 91; Charlesworth 2002: 99–106).

The *Nahum Pesher* is particularly important to our discussion because it helps us to identify the unnamed Jewish enemies of Jannaeus. It distinguishes between three Jewish sectarian groups that have traditionally been identified as follows.

The first, referred to as "Ephraim," also called the "Seekers After Smooth Things" (דורשי החלקות), is likely an appellation for the Pharisees. The second, called "Manasseh," is apparently the writer's name for the Sadducees. The third group, the community of the author, is designated as "Israel" or "Judah" and is usually identified with the author's community, which many associate with the Essenes.[3] The *Nahum Pesher* indicates that the Pharisees were the leading opponents of Jannaeus, and among those he executed, since it acknowledges that he crucified the "Seekers after Smooth Things" for their role in inviting Demetrius III to invade Judea (Dąbrowa 2010ab: 87–90; VanderKam 2001: 1.299–311). Dąbrowa notes that Josephus never mentions what the Pharisees offered Demetrius III. He suggests that they expected the Seleucid king to help them regain control over the temple and Judea's religious life (Dąbrowa 2010a: 175–81). In exchange, they were apparently willing to give up Judean independence. Dąbrowa speculates that Josephus, because he was closely connected with Pharisaic circles, omitted this information in his account to avoid portraying this Jewish sect in an unflattering light. However, if, as previously discussed, Demetrius III had already planned to invade Judea before the incident during the Festival of Tabernacles, the Pharisees had nothing to do with his incursion. Rather, they decided to prepare for it by igniting a civil war during Tabernacles. This holiday was particularly significant. Since Jonathan was consecrated as the first Hasmonean high priest during Tabernacles, this festival effectively became a yearly celebration of his family (1 Macc. 4:59; 2 Macc. 10:6; Rajak 2002: 39–60). Their decision to rebel against Jannaeus during this particular holiday was certainly a political and religious act.

The "Lion of Wrath" is also mentioned in fragmentary *Hosea Pesher*^{b} (4Q167). The relevant passage (frg. 2) reads:

1. [… nor can he heal you]r sore. The in]terpretation …]
2. […] the Lion of Wrath. For I will be like a young l[ion to E]ph[rai]m [and like a lion]
3. [to the house of Judah. Its interpretations con]cerns the last priest, who will stretch out his hand to strike Ephraim.

This fragment may explain the origin of this sobriquet. The author apparently noted the biblical passage "Ephraim went to Assyria and sent the great king" and understood it as a prediction of the invasion of Demetrius III with the assistance of the Pharisees. The writer likely took the sobriquet "Lion of Wrath" from the Hosea passage, which warns that God will 'be like a lion to Ephraim. Hanan Eshel suggests that the interpretation of Hosea 5:13 states that Demetrius III could neither help nor "heal" the wounds of the Pharisees. In light of this reconstruction, he proposes that the author of the *Nahum Pesher* took the epithet "Lion

3. Eshel 2008: 35, 40, 50, 133–6. The literature on these identifications is extensive. See further the following entries in Schiffman and VanderKam 2000: "Essenes" (1:262–9); "Kittim" (1:469–71); "Pharisees" (2:657–63); "Seekers After Smooth Things" (2:857–9).

of Wrath" from the *Hosea Pesher*^{b}, which in turn adopted the image from Hosea 5:14. Eshel's dating of the *Nahum Pesher* after the *Hosea Pesher*^{b} is important since the *Nahum Pesher* was clearly composed after Pompey's 63 BCE conquest of Jerusalem. Because the *Nahum Pesher* discusses many of the events in the *Hosea Pesher*^{b}, it shows that the events of the reign of Jannaeus were still remembered decades later. Although this *pesher* is so fragmentary that it is difficult to draw firm historical conclusions from it, its content and its use of the sobriquet "Ephraim" strongly supports Eshel's reconstruction. It suggests that the authors of the *Hosea Pesher*^{b} and the *Nahum Pesher* regarded the reign of Jannaeus as a pivotal moment in Judean history and the fulfillment of biblical prophecy. This could imply that the opponents of Jannaeus who were involved with the invasion of Demetrius III also may have been motivated to revolt due to their apocalyptic worldview, which subsequently influenced members of the Dead Sea Scrolls community.

4. The role of apocalyptic beliefs in the invasion of Demetrius III

Josephus and the Qumran text 4QApocryphon of Jeremiah C^{e} (4Q390) may offer some additional insight into possible religious factors that may have led the Pharisaic opponents of Jannaeus to help Demetrius III to invade Judea. Josephus offers two different dates for the beginning of the reign of Aristobulus, the first Hasmonean monarch. In his *War* (1.70) he writes that he became king "four hundred and seventy-one years and three months" after the return from the Babylonian captivity. His *Antiquities* (13.301) offers the figure of "four hundred and eighty-one years and three months." Both numbers are too large and likely represent an early interpretation of the seventy weeks of years, or 490 years, in Daniel 9:24-27. If one follows the figure in the *Antiquities,* and adds to it the one-year reign of Aristobulus, then Jannaeus began his reign close to the beginning of the 70th heptad (years 483–490). Because such calculations are theologically based, they are not to be taken seriously for reconstructing history. Rather, they reflect their respective authors' understandings about the importance of the Hasmonean period as the fulfillment of biblical prophecy.

Hanan Eshel suggests that the author of 4Q390 contemporized the 490-year prophecy of Daniel 9:24. The text appears to divide time into four sub-periods:

a) 70 years of the Babylonian exile.
b) 343 years in which the returnees from exile behaved properly.
c) 7 years of rule by Antiochus IV Epiphanes.
d) 70 years of Hasmonean rule.

He notes that the author believed that the final redemption would come after the 490 years. Whether the writer of 4Q390 counted from the purge of the Temple by Judah Maccabeus in 164 BCE or from 160 BCE, seven years after the statue of Zeus was placed in the Temple, is unspecified**.** The dates respectively correspond to 94 BCE or 90 BCE, which Eshel notes is close to the 88 BCE rebellion against

Jannaeus (Eshel 2008: 22–27). Because the numismatic evidence indicates that this revolt should be dated to SE 223 (=90/89 BCE), if we accept a starting date of 160 BCE for 4Q390 then its calculation of the end of Hasmonean rule coincides with the invasion of Demetrius III (cf. Dimant 2011: 33–7).

Lester L. Grabbe notes that Josephus's figure for the beginning of the reign of Aristobulus (*Ant.* 13.301) is 481 years and 3 months after the return from the Exile. Because he ruled for one year, Jannaeus would have begun his reign close to the beginning of the 70th heptad (years 483–490 BCE) (Grabbe 1997: 595–611). This suggests that Josephus was working with a tradition similar to that found in the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah* (4Q390 1 2–12), which uses Daniel 9:24-27 to date the last historical stage to the period of the Hasmonean revolt (Eshel 2005: 102–10; Werman 2006: 229–55). Grabbe notes that Josephus's numbers are reminiscent of the calculations that begin with Cyrus and end with the death of Jannaeus in Eusebius of Caesarea's *Demonstratio Evangelica* (8.2 §394b–d). He comments on these texts:

> The parallel with Josephus may be only coincidental: in fact, Eusebius may simply be offering his own calculations based on data from Josephus. Yet, this seems unlikely because in this section he is commenting on Julius Africanus and does not treat Josephus until later. It is therefore intriguing to ask whether both Josephus and Eusebius are drawing on an earlier Jewish interpretation of the 70 weeks. (Grabbe 1997: 601)

Although it is unlikely that Josephus and Eusebius used 4Q390, it is probable that all drew upon a common source that considered the reign of Jannaeus to be the fulfillment of biblical prophecy. If the understanding of Daniel reflected in 4Q390 was *widespread*, some Jews at this time may have believed that they were living in the last days. Events in Seleucia convinced them that biblical prophecy was now coming to fulfillment.

This interpretation of Daniel in 4Q390 may have prompted the author of this Qumran text to write this composition that called for the end of the Hasmoneans' priestly succession and political control.[4] It may also account for the overt hostility towards Jannaeus at this time and help us to understand why some of his countrymen took up arms against him. Assuming the accuracy of Dimant's thesis that 4Q390 is one of five copies of the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah,* we can compare it with the other more extant fragments of this work to see if there is any evidence that it reflects a negative view of Jannaeus. A passage in 4Q387 3 4–6 may contain a denunciation of his high priesthood. This fragment, which is paralleled in a less complete form in 4Q385a 5 4–9, contains the following line:

כהנים שלושה אשר לא יתהלכו בדרכי [הכהנים ה]ראשנים על שם אלהי ישראל יקראו (4Q387 3 4–5).

4. Suggested by Albert Baumgarten as noted by Eshel 2008: 131 n.43.

Dimant originally translated this passage in her *edition princeps* as: "three priests who will not walk in the ways of [the former [priests] who by the name of the God of Israel were called." She understood this passage as referring to three priests who were initially faithful to their vocation.[5] In her most recent assessment of this text, she slightly changes her translation to read: "three priests, who will not walk in the ways of [the] former [priests], will be called by the name of the God of Israel" (Dimant 2011: 34 n.67). Dimant now understands the phrase "who will not walk in the ways of [the] former [priests]" to stand as a subordinate description stressing what the three priests are not. She proposes that they are positive figures, and likely Jonathan, Simon, and John Hyrcanus. If we adopt this interpretation, then lines 6–7, which state that "Israel will be rent asunder in th[at] generation, each m[a]n fighting against his neighbor," may refer to the civil wars that took place during the reign of Jannaeus.[6] This may suggest that apocalyptic timetables prompted some Jewish sectarian groups, especially the Pharisees, to oppose Jannaeus based on their belief that the final age of redemption had arrived.

5. Conclusion

The reign of Jannaeus represents a pivotal era in Hasmonean history. His time in power witnessed increased Jewish militarism and an unprecedented expansion of the Hasmonean State. It was also a time of great sectarian conflict when a largely Pharisaic-supported invasion by the Seleucid monarch Demetrius III took place. Josephus and the Qumran texts, both of which mention this event, offer some additional insights into the religious factors that led the opponents of Jannaeus to help Demetrius III invade Judea. This evidence, when used in conjunction with new archaeological and numismatic discoveries, allows us to determine the precise date of this event, as well as additional references to it in several Qumran writings. These texts contain valuable and overlooked insights into the pervasive apocalyptic worldview of this period. They contain a schematization of history largely based on interpretations of the 490 years of Daniel 9:24-27 in light of

5. Dimant 2001: 192. In her interpretation of this text (ibid., 193) she suggests that the three priests of line 4 are likely Jason, Menelaus, and Alcimus, or possibly Simon, John Hyrcanus, and Jannaeus. She also comments, based on the allusion in 1QpHab VIII 8–9, that line 5 may refer to priests of the First Temple period or earlier generations of the Second Temple period.

6. It is plausible that the denunciation of "the slaves of foreign things" (ועבדי נאכר; 4Q387 3 6) refers to the mercenaries employed by Jannaeus and their influence over him. Reynolds (2011: 298–300) proposes that Jannaeus cannot be included in this list because it only mentions four priests, and that the final priest should be identified with John Hyrcanus during whose tenure he believes the text was composed. His analysis, however, is based on the section in 4Q387 and fails to consider the future temporal outline of the passage that is used to describe an inner rift in Israel to reflect negative attitudes towards the Hasmonean kings (see further Dimant 2011: 194–5).

Jannaeus's reign. The dating of several Qumran texts to this specific historical event sheds additional light on the development and social background of similar chronologies in Eusebius's *Demonstratio Evangelica* as well as works that comprise 1 Enoch and the Qumran corpus.

Apocalyptic thought appears to have played a major role in Second Temple history by contributing to the formation of distinctive Jewish sects. A variety of Jewish social groups used the apocalyptic worldview to promote violence both against Hellenistic imperial rule and the Hasmonean State. This sectarian violence peaked during the reign of Jannaeus when some Jewish sects, especially the Pharisees, encouraged by their apocalyptic understanding of history, forcibly tried to help usher in the final age of redemption by participating in the Judean invasion of Demetrius III. If not for the death of Eusebes, Demetrius III likely would have continued his campaign against Jannaeus and removed him from power. Josephus's claim that Demetrius III withdrew because of the defection of some Jews in his forces is untenable since their presence in the Seleucid army was minimal. The death of Eusebes explains why Demetrius III, deep in Judean territory, abruptly abandoned his thus far successful campaign against Jannaeus. Demetrius III had no option but to return home to Syria to gather an even larger force to attack his brother.

Jannaeus introduced some innovations in his currency following the battle of Shechem that may testify to apocalyptic beliefs at this time. He minted a series of coins that contain the same inscription found on his earlier coins, but in paleo-Hebrew letters. They include a depiction of an anchor on one side and a star surrounded by a diadem on the other. Meshorer suggests this star is a symbol of royalty and was based on Numbers 24:17 (Meshorer 2001: 37–8). Another series of his coins, however, do not mention his kingship, but only refer to his office of high priest (יהונתן [ינתן] הכהן הגדל וחבר היהודים) (Meshorer 2001: 38–9). Jannaeus also issued a variety of coins with Greek (ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΟΣ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΥ/ ΛΚΕ) and Aramaic (אלכסנדרון שנה כה) inscriptions (Mine 1981: 49–67). These are unique because they bear a single date, which correlates to the twenty-fifth year of his reign (80–79 BCE). Given their late date, Meshorer speculates that Jannaeus included an Aramaic inscription to appease the Pharisees since it is the language used in earlier Hasmonean currency (Meshorer 2001: 40–1). Arthur Houghton and Arnold Spaer, noting the similarity between the later coins of Jannaeus and those Demetrius III minted in Damascus suggest that the former king imitated the currency of the latter (Houghton 1990: 3–4). This may have been a conscious decision by Jannaeus to subvert the biblical imagery of his opponents, and to portray himself as a sort of deliverer in contrast to Demetrius III, and to challenge those whom he believed had interpreted biblical prophecy falsely.

Bibliography

Amusin, J. D. (1977), "The Reflection of Historical Events of the First Century B.C. in Qumran Commentaries (4Q161; 4Q169; 4Q166)," *HUCA*, 48: 123–52.

Atkinson, Kenneth (2007), "Representations of History in 4Q331 (4QpapHistorical Text C), 4Q332 (4QHistorical Text D), 4Q333 (4QHistorical Text E), and 4Q468e (4QHistorical Text F): An Annalistic Calendar Documenting Portentous Events?" *Dead Sea Discoveries*, 14: 125–51.

Atkinson, Kenneth (2011), "The Historical Chronology of the Hasmonean Period in the *War* and *Antiquities* of Flavius Josephus: Separating Fact from Fiction," in Menachem Mohr, Pnina Stern, and Jack Pastor (eds), *Flavius Josephus: Interpretation and History* (Leiden: Brill), 7–27.

Bar-Kochva, Bezalel (1996), *Pseudo Hecataeus, On the Jews: Legitimizing the Jewish Diaspora* (Berkeley: University of California).

Berrin, Shani L. (2004), *The Pesher Nahum Scroll from Qumran; An Exegetical Study of 4Q169* (Leiden: Brill).

Bevan, Edwyn R. (1902), *House of Seleucus* (London: E. Arnold).

Bellinger, Alfred R. (1949), "The End of the Seleucids," *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences*, 38: 51–102.

Charlesworth, James H. (2002), *The Pesharim and Qumran History: Chaos or Consensus?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).

Dąbrowa, Edward (2010a), "Demetrius III in Judea," *Electrum* 18: 175–81.

Dąbrowa, Edward (2010b), *The Hasmoneans and their State: A Study in History, Ideology, andthe Institutions* (Kraków: Jagiellonian University Press).

Dimant, Devorah (2001), *Qumran Cave 4.XXI: Parabiblical Texts, part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts* (DJD 30; Oxford: Clarendon).

Dimant, Devorah (2011), "Pseudo-Ezekiel and The Apocryphon of Jeremiah C in Perspective," *RevQ*, 25: 33–7.

Ehling, Kay (2008), *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der späten Seleukiden (164-63 v. Chr.): vom Tode des Antiochos I. bis zur Einrichtung der Provinz Syria unter Pompeius* (Stuttgart: Steiner).

Eshel, Hanan (2005), "4Q390, the 490-Year Prophecy, and the Calendrical History of the Second Temple Period," in Gabriele Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans), 102–10.

Eshel, Hanan (2008), *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hasmonean State* (Grand Rapids, MI:William B. Eerdmans).

Grabbe, Lester L. (1997), "The Seventy-Weeks Prophecy (Daniel 9:24-27) in Early Jewish Interpretation," in Craig A. Evans and Shemaryahu Talmon (eds), *The Quest for Context and Meaning* (Leiden: Brill), 595–611.

Hölscher, Gustav (1904), *Die Quellen des Josephus für die Zeit vom Exil bis zum jüdischenKriege* (Leipzig: B. G. Tuebner).

Hoover, Oliver D. (2007), "A Revised Chronology for the Late Seleucids at Antioch (121/120–64 BC)," *Historia: Zeitschrift für alte Geschichte* 56: 280–301.

Hoover, Oliver D., Arthur Houghton, and Petr Vesley (2008), "The Silver Mint of Damascusunder Demetrius III and Antiochus XII (97/6 BC–83/2 BC)," *American Numismatic Society*, Second Series, 20: 305–36.

Houghton, Arthur (1987), "The Double Portrait Coins of Antiochus XI and Philip I: A Seleucid Mint at Beroea?" *Schweizerische Numismatische Rundschau* 66: 79–84.

Houghton, Arthur (1989), "The Royal Seleucid Mint of Seleucia on the Calycadnus," in Georges Le Rider et al. (eds), *Kraay Mørkholm Essays: Numismatic Studies in Memory of C. M. Kraay and O. Mørkholm* (Louvain: Institut Supérieur d'Archéologie et d'Histoire de l'Art), 77–98.

Houghton, Arthur (1998), "The Struggle for the Seleucid Succession, 94–92 BC: A New

Tetradrachm of Antiochus XI and Philip I of Antioch," *Schwizerische numismatische Rundschau* 77: 66–8.
Houghton, Arthur and Arnold Spaer (1990), "New Silver Coins of Demetrius III and Antiochus XII at Damascus," *Schweizer Münzblätter* 40: 1–5.
Kasher, Aryeh (1990), *Jews and Hellenistic Cities in Eretz-Israel: Relations of the Jews with the Hellenistic Cities During the Second Temple Period (332 BCE–70CE)* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr).
Klausner, Joseph (1972), "Judah Aristobulus and Jannaeus Alexander," in A. Schalit (ed.), *The World History of the Jewish People VI: The Hellenistic Age* (New Brunswick:Rutgers University Press), 222–41.
Meshorer, Ya'akov (2001), *A Treasury of Jewish Coins* (Nyack, NJ: Amphora).
Mine, Henryk (1981), "Coins of Alexander Yannai," *Journal of the Society for Ancient Numismatics* 12: 49–67.
Newell, Edward T. (1978), *The Seleucid Mint of Antioch* (Chicago: Obol International).
Reynolds III, Bennie H. (2011), *Between Symbolism and Realism: The Use of Symbolic and Non-Symbolic Language in Ancient Jewish Apocalypses 333-63 BCE* (Göttingen:Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
Rubenstein, Jeffrey L. (1995), *History of Sukkot in the Second Temple and Rabbinic Periods* (Atlanta: Scholars Press).
Schiffman, Lawrence H. and James C. VanderKam (eds) (2000), *Encyclopedia of the Dead SeaScrolls* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
Schürer, Emil (1973), *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D.135)*, revised and edited by Geza Vermes et al. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark).
VanderKam, James C. (2004), *From Joshua to Caiaphas; High Priests after the Exile* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press).
VanderKam, James C. (2001), "Pesher Nahum and Josephus," in A. J. Avery-Peck et al. (eds), *When Judaism and Christianity Began* (Leiden: Brill), 1.299–311.
Werman, Cana (2006), "Epochs and End-Time: The 490-Year Scheme in Second Temple Literature," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 13: 229–55.

Response to Atkinson

Albert I. Baumgarten

i.

The immediate significant contribution of this paper is to help explain what otherwise remains mysterious: Josephus's explanation of the decision of Demetrius's Jewish supporters to transfer their loyalty back to Alexander Jannaeus—a catastrophic decision the consequences of which they should have foreseen. Did they really pity Alexander Jannaeus? What were they thinking? As Atkinson argues persuasively, given Jannaeus's record of cruelty, "surely these Jews would not have been foolish enough to expect him to forgive their betrayal" (46). Atkinson solves this "puzzlement," offering an alternative which is far more plausible.

Atkinson proposes that the crucial event was not the "re-ratting" of Demetrius's Jewish supporters back to Jannaeus but the death of Antiochus X Eusebes, as a result of which Demetrius III decided to leave Judea to attack his brother Philip I, an attack which eventually failed and saw Demetrius III captured and taken to Parthia, where he died. Atkinson argues that the Jewish forces in Demetrius's army were minimal, in any case, so that even if they deserted, the consequences would not have been significant. However, now that Antiochus X Eusebius was dead, more serious dynastic matters were at stake for Demetrius III in Syria, and so he left Judea, which then allowed Jannaeus to overcome his local opponents with the full force of his wrath. These conclusions are based on attentive reading of recent scholarship on the history of the Seleucid dynasty and especially on careful analysis of the numismatic evidence, all of which contribute to making these conclusions convincing.

This foundation allows Atkinson to offer one more far-reaching conclusion: identifying Jannaeus's opponents as the Pharisees. Atkinson effectively concedes that nowhere in the extant sources are the Pharisees explicitly named as Jannaeus's opponents (49–51). Instead, Atkinson relies on a series of inferences, based mainly on 4QpNah, and on the identification of the "seekers after smooth things"="Ephraim" in that text as a sobriquet for the Pharisees.

Atkinson's bolsters his case for Pharisaic involvement in the rebellion by referring to *m. Sukkah* 4:9. However, the latter is a much later source, edited at least a century after Josephus, and all it tells us is that an unnamed high priest was pelted with citrons by "all the people" for not performing the water libation ritual properly. Even a later Rabbinic source, such as *t. Sukkah* 3:16 (Lieberman 1962a: 270), does not add the crucial details. The priest there is an unidentified Boethusian, but the main point of the story is to tell that as a result of the fusillade one of the horns of the altar was damaged, so that the Temple service was cancelled that day, until they replaced the horn with a block of salt. Much the same is true of *b. Sukkah* 48b, except that priest there is an unnamed Sadducee,

and Rashi, commenting on the passage, explains that the fusillade also consisted of stones, and that is why the horn of the altar was damaged. Atkinson, following the lead of many distinguished scholars (e.g. Lieberman 1962b: 881), argues that these Rabbinic stories about the priest assaulted with citrons "can only refer to Alexander Jannaeus" (49), based on *Ant.* 13.372. Nevertheless, this is vague testimony at best, as the sources do not really overlap in a way that allows them to be combined without a wide stretch of the imagination: (1) Josephus says nothing about why Jannaeus was pelted with citrons; (2) the Rabbinic accounts do not identify Jannaeus as the target; and (3) neither the Rabbinic sources nor Josephus name the aggressors who threw the citrons.

I suggest that there is other—perhaps better—evidence that the Pharisees were Jannaeus's opponents, based on an inference from Josephus (perhaps this inference played a crucial role, from the outset, in identifying the "seekers after smooth things"="Ephraim" in 4QpNah as the Pharisees). Josephus informs us that when the Pharisees were in power, at the time of Salome Alexandra, they took particular vengeance on the advisers of Jannaeus who had encouraged him to crucify the 800 men (*War* 1.113; *Ant*. 13.410–11). This suggests, at the very least, that Pharisees were prominent among the victims of the crucifixion, and this was why the Pharisees wanted to avenge themselves on Jannaeus's advisers. In turn, if Pharisees were high among those who suffered this awful mass punishment, the simplest explanation should be that this was because they had a leading role among those who fomented the revolt among the Jews against Jannaeus. Perhaps they were especially prominent among those Jews who resisted Jannaeus to the bitter end, and whom he besieged and eventually conquered in Bethsemelis/Bethoma (*War* 1.96; *Ant.* 13.379). Perhaps they believed in the millennial promises Atkinson attributes to them so strongly that no dose of disconfirmation could shake their faith, and as an expression of that faith they fought to the end. If so, this would hardly be the first instance of a group that went to their deaths because of their firm belief in the imminent redemption of the world. Josephus thus drew a line connecting avengers of the crucifixion and its rebel-victims. If the Pharisees had an explicit important place at the avengers' end of the line, they should also have an important place among the rebels at the beginning of the line, i.e. as playing a leading role among Jannaeus's Jewish opponents.

With this evidence in hand and the inferences it allows, it is easier to follow Atkinson in his analysis of the chronological calculations, based on the analysis of 4Q390 by the late Hanan Eshel, which may have encouraged the Pharisees to believe that the eschatological scenario was reaching its end at the time of Demetrius's plans to attack Jannaeus and motivated them to join in that battle to the bitter end, with all its awful consequences.

To summarize this part of the discussion, following Atkinson, I believe that one can demonstrate with a high degree of certainty: (1) that the Pharisees had an important role in the opposition to Jannaeus at the time of Demetrius III; and (2) that the people at Qumran had calculations of eschatological salvation to take place at around the year 90 BCE, just when the events concerning Demetrius III were unfolding, according to Atkinson's revision of the usual chronology.

What remains more speculative—I would call it Atkinson's attempt to draw a line connecting the dots—is Atkinson's conclusion that the Pharisees also "calculated the end" in a manner similar to that known from Qumran and that these Pharisaic convictions that chronology proved that the end was near were among their motivations in deciding to collaborate with Demetrius III against Jannaeus.

ii.

In support of Atkinson's more daring conclusion I offer the following. Based on comparative evidence, I have found that when millennial hopes are flourishing, these hopes are understood in ever changing ways all up and down the political, social, educational, and intellectual ladders (Baumgarten 2005: 65). Royal propaganda of the Middle Ages promoted eschatological hopes to be fulfilled by the monarch (Kantorowicz 1957: 42–87). In seventeenth-century England, for example, even bishops, cardinals, and kings proposed their own visions of what the end of days that were soon to come would be like, each vision different, but consistent with the place in society, and with a role in the end of days that suited the position, objectives, and outlook of those who promoted that vision (Lamont 1969). Millennialism is not only the dream of the "down and outs," the deprived of one sort or other, a conclusion that had been emphasized in our own times by the analysis of Ravitzky (1996). The Pharisees of the second century BCE may have been a "reformist" type sect, a part of the "mainstream establishment" of their time, with good connections to the king and court at the time of Hyrcanus, and even better days to come during the reign of Salome Alexandra. However, that did not mean that they were not susceptible to being convinced that the eschatological end was near, and taking decisive (risky?) steps to fulfill those beliefs. Furthermore, again based on comparative evidence, when chronological calculations of the end are in favor with one group, they can often jump to other groups of their time and place, who then work these same expectations into their own systems (Baumgarten 2005: 60–1, 69 n.13). In the end, therefore, Atkinson's suggestion that the Pharisees of Jannaeus's reign were inspired by eschatological calculations much like those we know from Qumran strikes me as eminently plausible.

If this is true for the Pharisees, what about Jannaeus? Atkinson offers numismatic evidence to indicate the means Jannaeus may have employed to counter his opponents, "to challenge those whom he believed had interpreted Biblical prophecy falsely" (55), but I believe this conclusion can be elaborated in much more general terms if one follows the examples proposed by Lamont. Might Jannaeus (and/or his supporters) have shared the conviction that chronology proved that the end was near and offered his (or their) own understanding of the implications of the calculations, namely, that Jannaeus was the embodiment of the promise of the end of days?

To begin with, according to Josephus, divine consent for the accession of Alexander Jannaeus was intimated by the story of his father Hyrcanus's dream,

in which Hyrcanus asked God which of his sons would succeed him and was shown the features of Alexander, much to Hyrcanus's dismay (he loved best his sons Antigonus and Aristobulus). Hyrcanus supposedly tried to prevent this result by human means, sending Alexander to be brought up in the Galilee, and never seeing his son for as long as he lived, but all to no avail (Josephus, *Ant*. 13.322–323). After the year-long reign of Aristobulus—during which Antigonus was murdered on royal command (Josephus, *War* 1.72–80; *Ant*. 13.302–313), a plot in which Aristobulus's wife had a hand (Josephus, *War* 1.76), and the other brothers imprisoned (Josephus, *War* 1.71; *Ant*. 13.302, 320)—the monarchy devolved upon Alexander. This result was managed by Aristobulus's widow (Josephus, *War* 1.85; *Ant*. 13.320), whom Alexander later apparently married. On coming to power, Alexander executed another of his brothers as a potential aspirant to the throne (Josephus, *War* 1.85). These must have been particularly delicate (but also violent) matters, suitably reinforced by the story of Hyrcanus's dream.

Rabbinic sources supply another possible hint in the account of the feast held after Yannai's victories, as related in *bQid*. 66a. The text has been much discussed and the archaic nature of the vocabulary and other forms of expression have been noted by scholars since the end of the previous century. This account "knew" the historical fact that there was opposition between Yannai and the Pharisees and explained this fact in its own narrative fashion, as the result of a dispute that erupted at a banquet (Baumgarten 1995; Noam 2014). Scholarly attention has been transfixed by the comparison between the Rabbinic story and the parallel in Josephus, *Ant*. 13.288–298 about a break between John Hyrcanus and the Pharisees that took place at a banquet. What has been less discussed is the opening of the story. King Yannai won a desert victory in Kohalit (an unknown place, but mentioned in the Copper Scroll; compare Zissu 2001 and Lefkovits 2000: 74–6). In celebration, Yannai invited the sages to a party at which mallows (a desert food, see Job 30:4) were served on golden tables. This evoked memories of ancestors who also ate mallows, in poverty, when rebuilding the Second Temple on returning from the Babylonian exile. We eat mallows, as they did, the story told, but we do so in an atmosphere of triumph, on golden tables. By implication, our era is one of redemption, as was that of the return from Babylonia, but the salvation in our times will be even greater (more complete, even final?), as we now are victorious. I see this part of the story as an indication that the royal house was also an active participant in encouraging the belief that its era was the eschatological end, but with a message and conclusion entirely different from that of the Pharisees.

One of the discordant notes in this story is the charge against Yannai that he was unfit for the priesthood because his mother had been taken captive at Modein (captive women were assumed to have been raped by their captors, a circumstance which would have rendered a son of such a captive woman ineligible to be a priest; but see also Josephus, *Ant*. 13.272, who reported the same charge against Jannaeus in more general terms: "that he was descended from captives and was unfit to hold office"). The charge was supposedly investigated and not sustained, but all this is chronologically awkward, if not worse, as Yannai was the grandson of Simon the Maccabee and at least two generations removed from the persecutions

at the time of Antiochus IV. What need was there to even investigate the charge? This encourages the idea that there may have been other reasons for Pharisaic opposition to Yannai, not related by the story: if the royal message behind the celebration in *bQid*. 66a was one of dynastic messianism inspired by victories in conjunction with chronological calculations, and if the Pharisees understood the significance of the chronology in very different terms, as proposed by Atkinson, as a harbinger of Yannai's downfall, perhaps that was one source of the tension between Yannai and his Pharisaic opponents.

iii.

Like any excellent article, Atkinson's analysis leaves the reader wishing that one could go further and learn more, even if the evidence is unavailable and answers impossible. I mention two such examples: one concerning the Pharisees, the other Josephus. If one follows Atkinson and is convinced that one reason the Pharisees were moved to act against Jannaeus was because they calculated that the time was ripe—in other words, that the 490 years based on Jeremiah were now coming to their glorious and victorious conclusion—I wish we could know just how the Pharisees came to this conclusion. Was it like what we have learned from 4Q390 or did they have some other exegetical key?

Next, however the Pharisees arrived at these conclusions, how important were chronological calculations in determining their actions? Perhaps it would be more important to stress that they saw an opportunity to get rid of a cruel Sadducean High Priest with the help of a foreign ruler, and the pursuit of the millennium was only an extra confirmation encouraging action, at best? Or perhaps they were interested in taking advantage of the popularity that accrues to those who are willing to take the chance of standing up to a tyrant in order to benefit from the stature that would then enhance their ability to run the Temple according to their lights (Baumgarten 2011)? In other words, what did they expect to receive from Demetrius III in return for their support against Jannaeus? Coalition partners have lots of good (and bad) reasons to agree to work together.

Next, especially according to Atkinson, why did Josephus choose to tell the story the way he did? Why did he want to make it seem as if Jewish loyalties were the key in Jannaeus's initial defeat and then in the dramatic turn of events that allowed Jannaeus's victory, and not "outside" factors in the history of the rivalry of Seleucid dynasts, as proposed by Atkinson? This is especially puzzling when it comes to the incredibly stupid and unrealistic "pity" the rebels felt for Jannaeus, according to Josephus, that caused them to return to his ranks and many rebels to suffer cruel punishment. Were Josephus or his sources ignorant of the turn of events between Seleucid dynasts and did this obligate some other explanation? Atkinson comments on the degree of confusion in Josephus's accounts of Jannaeus's wars (49), so perhaps this is a direction in which we should seek an explanation.

Alternatively, perhaps Josephus explained the puzzling actions of the rebels as he did because he wanted to emphasize the loyalties of Jews to each other, as

opposed to foreign powers: perhaps that sort of explanation fit best his world view or that of his source(s). If so, it is worth noting the rough similarity of the actions of the Jews who returned to be loyal to Jannaeus "out of pity to him," with the story Josephus told concerning an earlier episode in Jannaeus's reign: Cleopatra III's Jewish general, Ananias, advised Cleopatra III not to deprive Jannaeus of his possessions, i.e. kingdom, because "an injustice done to this man will make all of us Jews your enemy" (*Ant.* 13.354). And all this despite the fact that Ananias belonged to the priestly family that founded the Temple at Leontopolis after they left Jerusalem. We might imagine that they would have welcomed an opportunity to return to power in Jerusalem under the auspices of Ptolemaic rule. However, Jewish loyalty to Jewish rulers seems to have been a theme in Josephus's writing.

iv.

To return to what we can know, when one recognizes the involvement of the Pharisees in political action against the ruling powers as a result of eschatological convictions at the time of Jannaeus, as proposed by Atkinson, this sheds light on at least one other incident in the career of the Pharisees.

I pass over the story of Herod's Eagle and of the two "sophists" with "well-founded reputations for accuracy in the laws of their country," who encouraged their followers to tear down the eagle (Baumgarten 2011). In the end, it is uncertain if these "sophists" were Pharisees. The well-founded reputation for accuracy in interpreting the laws may have been claimed by the Pharisees as their special prerogative, but that does not mean that there were no other claimants to that stature.

There is, however, no room for doubt concerning the events which Josephus recounted as taking place in the court of Herod, as narrated in *Ant.* 17 (Baumgarten 2008). Set in Herod's dying days—at a time of intrigue, betrayals, trials, and executions, with princes, their wives and mothers jockeying for position in the future, and with a dying king, almost certainly paranoid by modern criteria—a Pharisee, some Pharisees, or perhaps "the" Pharisees encouraged Herod's opponents to undermine his rule with hope of specific promises for the future of the benefits these opponents would enjoy. Josephus explained the basis for this ability of the Pharisees to make such promises because "God appeared to them, and that they therefore had foreknowledge of what would take place" (*Ant.* 17.43). Josephus also noted that unfortunately, instead of using these powers to help the king, they were employed to combat and injure him (*Ant.* 17.41). The prophecy that was broadcast in Herod's court was that God had decreed an end to Herod's reign (not such a daring prophecy since the mad king was dying, the princes were vying for succession, and some were executed, so anything was possible) and that the kingship would pass to Herod's brother Pheroras and his descendants (i.e. Pheroras would become the founder of the new dynasty; this was much more daring). Most daring of all, the eunuch Bagoas was promised that the king who was to come would enable him to marry and beget children.

The promises to Bagoas merit further attention. To enable a eunuch to marry and beget children, this "king" would need more than normal human powers—even far beyond the miracle stories told of many of the Roman emperors and much more than the supposed ability of Christian kings to cure skin diseases by their touch. This suggests that all these machinations had a millenarian component, based on the revelation supposedly received by the Pharisees from God. If all this was based on knowledge of the millennium acquired when God appeared to the Pharisees, according to Josephus, here we are in the presence of millennial excitement and may even be in the presence of the apocalyptic, in the specific sense of the term, as a message conveyed by revelation.

Josephus treated the whole episode with disdain: the Pharisees were effective among women (*Ant.* 17.41) and a eunuch, hardly the high-class clientele that should inspire respect. They were repaying Pheroras's wife in religious/political coin in exchange for the financial help she had given them (she paid a fine they were once assessed, *Ant.* 17.42). Josephus wanted us to think this was an unsavory story that reflected poorly on the Pharisees and we might agree, especially the promises to Bagoas. (At least one modern scholarly guardian of the honor of the Pharisees, Ellis Rivkin, went to great lengths to argue that his beloved Pharisees were not involved in these sordid deeds, but it was some other group of "separatists" who were so disreputable; Rivkin 1978: 321–4 n.3.) Yet even in an era of "profound historical agnosticism," when it is hard to know how much of this story is true and it is easy to dismiss this account as a piece of polemical writing, the parallel with the picture presented by Atkinson for the reign of Jannaeus is striking.

v.

Let me summarize: Atkinson offers a far more plausible explanation of the turn of events at the time of Jannaeus and Demetrius III. His argument makes the reader think about the sources he discusses and about other sources that his conclusions may illuminate. Millennial dreams can be confusing, obscure, and subject to reinterpretation as events unfold (Eshel 2009). If we hope to understand the ways in which millennial dreams affected the political and religious reality of different groups of ancient Jews—and the ways in which they fit into the "apocalyptic worldview" or "apocalyptic perspective," discussed at length at the Villa Cagnola—Atkinson supplies us with data and insights about one set of incidents that have the ability to sharpen our understanding of the pursuit of the millennium by ancient Jews.

Bibliography

Baumgarten, Albert I. (1995), "Rabbinic Literature as a Source for the History of Jewish Sectarianism in the Second Temple Period," *Dead Sea Discoveries*, 2: 14–57.

Baumgarten, Albert I. (2005), "Four Stages in the Life of a Millennial Movement," in Stephen D. O'Leary and Glenn S. McGhee (eds), *War in Heaven/Heaven on Earth*: *Theories of the Apocalyptic* (London: Equinox), 61–75.

Baumgarten, Albert I. (2008), "Pharisaic Authority: Prophecy and Power (*Ant.* 17.41–45)," in Adele Reinhartz and Wayne MacCready (eds), *Common Judaism – Explorations in Second-Temple Judaism* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press), 75–90, 234–41.

Baumgarten, Albert I. (2011), "Herod's Eagle," in Aren M. Maeir, Jodi Magness, and Lawrence H. Schiffman (eds), *"Go Out and Study the Land" (Judges 18:2): Archaeological, Historical and Textual Studies in Honor of Hanan Eshel* (Leiden: Brill), 7–21.

Eshel, H. (2009), "The Two Historical Layers of Pesher Habakkuk," in Anders Klostergaard Petersen et al. (eds), *Northern Lights on the Dead Sea Scrolls; Proceedings of the Nordic Qumran Network 2003-2006* (Leiden: Brill), 107–17.

Kantorowicz, Ernst H. (1957), *The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Mediaeval Political Theology* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Lamont, William L. (1969), *Godly Rule: Politics and Religion 1603–1660* (London: Macmillan).

Lefkovits, Judah K. (2000), *The Copper Scroll 3Q15: a Reevaluation: A New Reading, Translation, and Commentary* (Leiden, Brill).

Lieberman, Saul (1962a), *The Tosefta, According to Codex Vienna, With Variants from Codices Erfurt, London, Genizah MSS and Edition Princeps (Venice 1521)* (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America; in Hebrew).

Lieberman, Saul (1962b), *Tosefta Ki-fshuta: A Comprehensive Commentary on the Tosefta. Part IV, Order Mo'ed* (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America; in Hebrew).

Noam, Vered (2014), "The Story of King Jannaeus (*b. Qiddusin* 66*a*): A Pharisaic Reply to Sectarian Polemic," *Harvard Theological Review* 107: 31–58.

Ravitzky, Aviezer (1996), *Messiansim, Zionism and Jewish Religious Radicalism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Rivkin, Ellis (1978), *A Hidden Revolution* (Nashville: Abingdon).

Zissu, Boaz (2001), "The Identification of the Copper Scroll's 'Kahelet' at 'Ein Samiya in the Samaritan Desert," *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 133: 145–58.

Response to Atkinson

Sandra Gambetti

Building upon the two important studies on Hasmonaean history by Eshel and Dąbrowa, this paper works on one of the last episodes of the barely documented Seleucid history of the first century BCE. Evidence from the Qumran scrolls and Seleucid numismatics are at the basis of Atkinson's argument. The effort is highly commendable, particularly in the almost total absence of evidence for the events surrounding the Samaria and Judea invasion of Demetrius III, the core interest of this paper. However, I am skeptical about the methodology Atkinson applies in this paper, and the necessary conclusions therefrom.

1) Atkinson says that Demetrius's numismatic emission in Damascus, dated to 90 BCE, contains political information that invites to redetermine the reasons why Demetrius invaded Samaria and Judea. In the absence, as in the present case, of any historical narrative from antiquity, a coin issue—as important a datum as it is *per se*—remains a quantitative piece of information that does not carry with it any historical or political information. For all we know, Demetrius might have minted those coins for gambling. The mere numismatic datum does not constitute evidence that Demetrius had already planned to invade Samaria and Judea on his own accord.

2) It is therefore improper to dismiss Josephus's account of Demetrius's Samaria and Judea invasion on the basis of an argument built on this numismatic evidence. Contradicting the ancient historian, Atkinson justifies Demetrius's decision to march south as an attempt to take revenge for a previous Hasmonaean–Nabataean Transjordan invasion, which, in his opinion, determined Demetrius's loss of Damascus. The only evidence for the Hasmonaean–Nabataean Transjordan campaign is in Josephus, who nowhere indicates any of those events. That, therefore, Demetrius decided to invade Samaria and Judea in order to take revenge remains unsupported by evidence. According to Josephus—who, it is useful to remind us here, provides the only available narrative—Demetrius ventured south because the Pharisees called him to wage war against Alexander Janneus. No historical evidence so far can invalidate Josephus's information.

3) In an effort not to dismiss completely Josephus's account, Atkinson reevaluates the role of the Pharisees in apocalyptic terms: the Pharisees eventually supported Demetrius because they saw in him the apocalyptic figure who would defeat Janneus on their behalf. He supports this conclusion with the help of some Qumran writings.

This is a topic that requires a thorough discussion. Against the background of current scholarship, Pharisaic apocalypticism, as Atkinson admits, is a problem. Nobody has so far assumed that the Pharisees embraced apocalypticism already at the beginning of the first century BCE, as he asserts. So far, Pharisaic apocalypticism has been discussed only against the background of New Testament literature. Some years ago L. Schiffman has compared the halachic thought of the early rabbis, thought to be the treasurers and carriers of Pharisaic thought,

to the anti-Pharisaic polemic found in early Dead Sea scrolls, and concluded that the issues that divided the people of the community from the Pharisees in the early first century BCE were the same as those discussed in the texts of the first and second centuries CE. In this way Schiffman has established a frame of discussion in favor of the continuity between the Pharisaic halachic thought of the late second and early first century BCE with later Pharisaic and early rabbinic positions. If Atkinson thinks that Pharisaic first and second century CE apocalypticism has elements of continuity with early first century BCE Pharisaisms, Schiffman's might be a possible methodological frame for such a discussion. In the absence of this, or similar, discussion, Atkinson's conclusion that the Pharisees in the first century BCE embraced apocalyptic ideas is problematic, being based only on Qumranic texts that can only support the apocalypticism of those who wrote them, not of their Pharisaic opponents.

2

Was the Maccabean Revolt an Apocalyptic Movement?[1]

Gerbern S. Oegema

1. Introduction

The main question to be raised in this paper is, what kind movement was the Maccabean Revolt: an apocalyptic, prophetic, or other movement? The Maccabean was a major event in the history of Second Temple Judaism. As such it was a response to a crisis within Judaism, but it was also the beginning of further developments and crises. How to understand the Maccabean Revolt in the larger context of Second Temple Judaism and especially in the context of the interplay of the social, religious, and political powers that shaped Jewish society in the Seleucid and Hasmonean period? Although it may not be possible to define these powers, we should at least identify them with the labels we put on them: apocalypticism, prophecy, and other currents of the time.[2] Here I want to focus on apocalypticism, relate it with some of the other powers at play, such as Biblical prophecy and Greek political theory, and ask how they might have influenced the Maccabean Revolt.

To begin with: before one can answer this question, one needs to understand and approach methodologically the nature and essence of apocalypticism in the time around the decisive year of 164 BCE. From a methodological point of view one

1. Paper read at the First Enoch Seminar, Nangeroni Meeting: The Seleucid and Hasmonean Periods and the Apocalyptic Worldview, June 25–28, 2012.

2. One could think here of early forms of democracy and liberation, as part of Greek political theory and philosophy, which may possibly have influenced Greek-speaking Jewish authors through education and assimilation. See Otto Kaiser, "Politische und persönliche Freiheit im jüdisch-hellenistischen Schrifttum des 2. Jh.s. v. Chr.," in Hermann Lichtenberger and Gerbern S. Oegema (eds), *Die Jüdischen Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit in ihrem antik-jüdischen und neutestamentlichen Kontext* (Studien zu den Jüdischen Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit, Vol. 1) (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2002), 43–58.

can discern in total six or seven ways to approach the question of the definition and possible development of apocalypticism[3] in Second Temple Judaism.[4] Three of these approaches represent a more classical scholarship, namely: 1) a history of literature approach, 2) a religion and tradition-historical approach, and 3) a theological approach; whereas the other three are of a more recent date, namely: 4) a reception-historical approach, 5) a social setting approach, and 6) an intellectual history approach.

In these contributions scholars are formulating quite a varied and different set of characteristics of apocalypticism, and see it as one of the main currents in Second Temple Judaism. With these characteristics it will be possible to understand how Biblical and non-Biblical writings, historical events, and socio-religious developments of all kinds can fit together in one complete picture.[5] On the basis of this I will try to formulate my own (seventh) approach and critically ask all of these approaches for their contribution to the question: how to define the Maccabean Revolt.

1.1 The history of literature approach

In the so-called history of literature approach, previous scholars have argued first of all that the roots of apocalypticism are to be found in post-exilic prophecy and

3. See for a history of research on apocalypticism Johann M. Schmidt, *Die jüdische Apokalyptik: die Geschichte ihrer Erforschung von den Anfängen bis zu den Textfunden von Qumran* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verl. d. Erziehungsvereins, 1969), and Paul D. Hanson, "Apocalyptic Literature," in Douglas A. Knight and Gene M. Tucker (eds). *The Hebrew Bible and Its Modern Interpreters* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985; 3rd print 1993), 465–88.

4. See for an excellent portrayal of Second Temple Judaism Lester L. Grabbe, *Judaic Religion in the Second Temple Period: Belief and Practice from the Exile to Yavneh* (London: Routledge, 2000) as well as Lester L. Grabbe. *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian*, 2 vols (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992). See for more details as well as bibliographical information Gerbern S. Oegema, *Apokalypsen* (JSHRZ-Supplementa, Vol. VI.1.5) (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2001), 1–8. See especially also the discussion in Lester L. Grabbe and Robert D. Haak (eds), *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, Apocalyptic and Their Relationships* (Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 46) (London: T&T Clark, 2003).

5. See for more details as well as bibliographical information Gerbern S. Oegema, *Apokalypsen* (JSHRZ-Supplementa, Vol. VI.1.5) (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2001), 1–8. See especially also the discussion in Lester L. Grabbe and Robert D. Haak (eds), *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, Apocalyptic and Their Relationships* (Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 46) (London: T&T Clark, 2003). Furthermore, and in addition to these main currents of Second Temple Judaism, one can also point to the possibility of utopian, conservative, and restorative powers at play, as represented by the various writings of the time and the people behind them, in the events that led to Maccabean uprising.

that second typical features of apocalypticism are eschatology, universalism, and individualism as well as specific positions on the law and ethics.[6] However, in a comparison with prophecy, in the past apocalypticism has often received the less favourable characteristics.[7] As for a more modern definition of apocalypticism in relation to prophecy, it is important to point to the work of Paul Hanson and the influence it has had on recent scholarship. Hanson defines apocalypticism in terms of visionary movement, eschatological perspective and symbolic universe, rivalry groups and contradictions between hopes and experiences, in order to distinguish it from prophecy. Behind the distinction is the supposition that prophecy has an historical worldview and apocalypticism a mythological one.[8] Even if this distinction recently has been questioned by, for example, Lester Grabbe and even if one would rephrase it differently, there is still much to be said about it.

Once Klaus Koch and the Society of Biblical Literature's Genres Project had established a direction in scholarship that differentiates between apocalypticism as historical movement and apocalypse as a genre of revelatory literature,[9] in the last third of the twentieth century the stage had now been set for a much more detailed study of apocalypses as individual literary products, both concerning their theological contents and their historical and social setting.[10]

6. Joachim Schmidt differentiates in his 1967 *Habilitationsschrift* on the history of research of Jewish apocalypticism between the so-called older and younger phase of the history of literature models of explanation (called phases I und II) and summarizes the older phase as follows; see Schmidt, *Apokalyptik*, 193–4.

7. Not without critique has been the hypothesis of a hasidaeic or essenic origin of apocalypticism. Some scholars have argued for a Babylonian origin of, for instance, the Book of Daniel, whereas others have suggested a Persian-Zoroastrian origin and a Zadokite setting of the earliest forms of apocalypticism. See Gerbern S. Oegema, "Prophecy and Apocalypticism," in ibid., *The Apocalyptic Interpretation of the Bible: Essays on Apocalypticism and Biblical Interpretation in Early Judaism, the Apostle Paul, the Historical Jesus and Their Reception History* (T&T Clark/Continuum 2012, Edinburgh).

8. See the discussion in Lester L. Grabbe, "Prophetic and Apocalyptic: Time for New Definitions – and New Thinking," in Grabbe et al., *Knowing the End*, 106–33, esp. 109–14.

9. Despite its ongoing critique of, for instance, Lester Grabbe. Whereas Joachim Schmidt discusses mainly the older German scholarship on apocalypticism, John J. Collins, who has just been quoted, offers an overview of the more recent and especially English-speaking studies. Collins sees in the work of Klaus Koch and the Society of Biblical Literature's Genres Project two important contributions to the modern study of apocalypticism. In the scholarship of Klaus Koch a differentiation is made between the "apocalypse" as literary genre and "apocalypticism" as historical movement. See Koch, K. *Ratlos vor der Apokalyptik: eine Streitschrift über ein vernachlässigtes Gebiet der Bibelwissenschaft und die schädlichen Auswirkungen auf Theologie und Philosophie* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1970).

10. Apart from other aspects, like the expression "One Like a Man," the use of the Hebrew Bible in the apocalypses, the question of traditional sources and the relation between wisdom and apocalypticism, especially the question of the place of apocalyptic literature in Early Judaism, has played an important role. As far as the question of literary

1.2. The religion- and tradition-historical approach

From a religion- and tradition-historical point of view, as for example in the work of Hermann Gunkel, we see that prophecy and apocalypticism are treated as two totally different and contrasting intellectual modes, which mutual opposition is defined foremost on the basis of its theological characterization.[11] In terms of the tradition- and redaction-history, one should not overlook that many older and newer commentaries on both the prophecies and the apocalypses use these methods as a (or the only) bridge between the actual text, the various stages of its development and their respective historical situations.[12]

1.3. The theological approach

Whereas little attention has of late been given to a more theological approach of prophetic and apocalyptic literature, this approach used to be dominant at least until one or two generations ago (see Rudolf Bultmann and Walter Schmitthals). There may, however, still be some advantage in giving a theological classification of both types of literature in the way they reflect on central religious questions, such as on the origin of evil, salvation, and the time of redemption. As these theological classifications do not necessarily have to be appropriated by denominational interests or by theological biases, they can very well serve to further elucidate common and distinctive features.[13] Theological and religiously relevant

genres is concerned, it is important to note that during the past decades also in the study of prophetic literature form-criticism has gone through important transitional phases and that the question about the intersection between form and life setting is still an extremely important one. See Marvin A. Sweeney and Ehud Ben Zvi (eds), *The Changing Face of Form-Criticism for the Twenty-First Century* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003).

11. This model of explanation of apocalypticism as developed since the end of the nineteenth century is summarized by Schmidt as follows: "With the use of the tradition historical approach Gunkel has sharply opposed prophecy and apocalypticism. The theological importance, which he gave to the latter, may explain the sharpness of his judgment. But there are several objections to be made against his argumentation, which by no means has lost its actuality. Above all and despite his efforts of a historical understanding of apocalypticism he has not given the aforementioned opposition any differentiation […] On the other hand Gunkel has been led by the image of the ideal prophet. Because for him prophecy was the summit of Israelite history of religion anyways, compared to prophecy's creative genius apocalypticism had to take upon it a contrasting role" (Schmidt, *Apokyptik*, 249–50). The younger phase of the history of literature model of explanation, according to Schmidt, has little new to offer in comparison with the older phase; however, he does underline its positive contribution to the study of apocalypticism. For Hermann Gunkel see above.

12. See for an excellent example Sigmund Mowinckel, *The Spirit and the Word: Prophecy and Tradition in Ancient Israel* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 2002).

13. See, for example, Walter Brueggemann, *A Commentary on Jeremiah: Exile and*

reflections remain to be relevant as long as society is developing. This growing awareness of the theological relevance of apocalypticism has been very well observed and phrased by John J. Collins.[14]

1.4. The social setting approach

A newer approach to apocalypticism is found in the efforts to determine its social origins and settings. In his book on *Prophecy and Apocalypticism: The Postexilic Setting* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995), Stephen L. Cook offers us his view on some of the so-called proto-apocalyptic texts: Ezekiel 38–39, Zechariah 1–8, and Joel and the groups behind them. Contrary to the previous scholarship of Paul Hanson and Otto Plöger, Cook does not believe that the apocalyptic groups are to be found among the socially and economically deprived classes and the marginal and socially alienated figures. Instead, while turning to sociological and anthropological analyses of apocalyptic groups and typologically characterizing them according to their relationship to their own society and to their own or other cultures, apocalypticism may very well have emerged from a wide variety of social matrices and have been under the leadership of many kinds of figures.

1.5. The reception-historical approach (1990–2008)

During the past two decades a number of studies on apocalypticism have dealt with the history of its reception in antiquity beyond the Second Temple period. To begin with, a collection of essays edited by David Hellholm, *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and in the Near East*, is a milestone in research at the end of the twentieth century and represents the papers presented at a colloquium in Uppsala in 1979. Three thematic fields and approaches have been dealt

Homecoming (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998) as well as Abraham J. Heschel, *The Prophets* (New York: Harper & Row, 1969–75).

14. John J. Collins (ed.). *Apocalypse. The Morphology of a Genre* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979), 360–1: "The growth in appreciation of symbolic and mythological literature has generally led to a more positive assessment of the apocalypses. Apocalyptic imagery is less often viewed as idle speculation but is seen to express an interpretation of historical situations (often political crises) and to shape the human response to those situations […] In this respect, the existential interpretation of apocalypticism offered by Bultmann and Schmithals is noteworthy, even if it has not always done full justice to the allusiveness of the mythological symbolism. Martin Buber's sweeping condemnation of apocalyptic determinism and of the use of pseudonymity as an evasion of responsibility can now be seen as a misunderstanding of the function of apocalypses. Equally, the view that the apocalyptic use of history is directed only to a calculation of the end-time has been discredited […] Instead, the apocalyptic reviews of history serve to highlight the short period before the end, which is the actual time of the author, as a period of decision." See also Lester, L., *Priests, Prophets, Diviners, Sages: A Socio-Historical Study of Religious Specialists in Ancient Israel* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1995).

with in this impressive book: 1) the conceptual world of apocalypticism; 2) the literary genre of the apocalypse; and 3) the sociology of apocalypticism and the life setting of the apocalypses. At the end of the collection K. Rudolph emphasizes the following important problematic fields for future research: 1) Jewish-Christian apocalypticism; 2) apocalypticism of primitive and early Christianity; 3) the relation between apocalypticism and Gnosticism; and 4) the influence of Iranian-Zoroastrian tradition on Biblical apocalypticism.

For future research he points at the importance of the literary scientific and sociological methods as well as the need of an intensive study of the reception history of apocalypticism until today.[15] However, what I see as still lacking is a reception history of prophecy and apocalypticism in the Second Temple period itself, in particular also a study of the inner-Biblical and post-Biblical development of apocalyptic thinking in relation to prophetic thinking.[16]

1.6. The intellectual history approach

As for the intellectual history approach and especially for the hypothesis of a "common apocalyptic worldview," in a collection of articles edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins, *The Early Enoch Literature* (2007), we find some very useful methodological arguments and criteria of how to compare two

15. The question of a reception history from the beginning until the twentieth century is dealt with in great detail in a book published between 1998 and 2000: *The Encylopedia of Apocalypticism* (Vol. I: The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity, edited by J. J. Collins; Vol. II: Apocalypticism in Western History and Culture, edited by B. McGinn; and Vol. III: Apocalypticism in the Modern Period and the Contemporary Age, edited by S. J. Stein), as well as in studies by James VanderKam, William Adler, and myself. The relation between Jewish, Christian, and Gnostic apocalypticism has also been investigated with the help of the reception-historical approach by James C. VanderKam and William Adler in their book, *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1996). Published in the year 1999 is a study of G. S. Oegema, *Zwischen Hoffnung und Gericht. Untersuchungen zur Rezeption der Apokalyptik im frühen Christentum und Judentum* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlagshaus, 1999). Three main questions are given attention to: 1) the later history of apocalypticism on the basis of the literary characteristics of the genre "apocalypse"; 2) the canonization of apocalypses or their exclusion from the Jewish and Christian canons; and 3) a possible interdependency between Jewish and Christian apocalypticism. Especially the reception history of apocalypticism is still a desideratum of research.

16. See for the former Gerbern S. Oegema, "Back to the Future in the Early Church: The Use of the Book of Daniel in Early Patristic Eschatology," in Patricia Kirkpatrick et al. (eds), *The Function of Ancient Historiography* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2008), 186–98, and Gerbern S. Oegema, "The Heritage of Jewish Apocalypticism in Late-Antique and Early Medieval Judaism, Christianity and Islam," in R. Wisnovsky et al. (eds), *Vehicles of Transmission, Translation, and Transformation in Medieval Cultures* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012), 103–29.

different literary corpora, in this case the Books of 1 Enoch and the Dead Sea Scrolls. The articles in this collection are useful as an analogy to the question of a relation between prophecy and apocaylypticism, as the Dead Sea Scrolls offer many actualizing interpretations of the prophetic writings and 1 Enoch is an early representative of Jewish apocayticism.

In analogy to 1 Enoch and the DSS, but in reference to the relation between prophecy and apocalypticism, we can learn from these studies that we have to distinguish between what both groups of works or movements may have had in common and in what they may have differed. Possible common characteristics between prophecy and apocalypticism are: opposition to other groups; cross-fertilization; and shared apocalyptic worldview. Possible distinctive features are: origin and social setting; use of eschatology and other key expressions; complexity and fragmentary character; and different attitudes towards Torah and Temple, to mention but a few.[17]

1.7 Was the Maccabean Revolt influenced by apocalypticism?

When we now move on to the question, seen from the perspective of the history of research, whether the Maccabean Revolt was influenced by the apocalyptic current or way of thinking of the time, we can raise the following. With the older history of literature approach, we can ask whether any of its features were of an eschatological, universal, and individual nature, and whether it reflects any specific positions on the law and ethics. Also, what can be said about its origin: was it hasidaeic or essenic, or even Babylonian, Persian-Zoroastrian, or Zadokite? What I believe can be said with a certain degree of certainly is that, although the Maccabean Revolt is not specifically known for its eschatological, universal, or individual features, it does reflect very clear opinions about the law and ethics, as this is at the very heart of the movement and the direct cause of the revolt, at least according to 1 and 2 Maccabees. And there is clearly also a hasidaeic/essenic connection, or, if we may believe certain passages, even a hasidaeic origin. Although it is difficult to discern what the main issues were on the eve of the Maccabean Revolt, other than that it was in very broad terms a response to Hellenism and the Syrian policy of religious reforms, also the quest for religious identity did play an important role in it, independent of the question of how this religious identity is to be defined.[18]

17. Here one also may want to refer to the work of Michel Foucault and Jacques Derrida. Following their thoughts, the apocalyptic worldview can be understood as a social construct of a particular period in history, part of a discourse the meaning of which we do not fully understand anymore. In the case of apocalyptic literature, efforts to define (and differentiate between) what is perceived as "reality" and the representations or signs are confronted with the question, what is the "reality" in the apocalyptic worldview: is it the realm of history, mythology, or language? Moreover, how does this relate to what we perceive as reality?

18. As for the study of religious identity in antiquity, after the groundbreaking

Furthermore, with Paul Hanson, we can ask whether the Maccabean Revolt represents a visionary movement, had an eschatological perspective and a symbolic universe, and whether rivalry groups and contradictions between hopes and experiences were involved, in order to distinguish it with its mythological worldview from prophecy with its more historical worldview, despite the fact that this distinction has been questioned by, for instance, Lester Grabbe.[19] Here one can state that the Maccabees were not really at the head of a visionary movement, even though it was their vision to restore the national independency and the borders of the former kingdom of David. Contrary to 1 Maccabees, 2 Maccabees does employ some elements of a symbolic universe, but in a rather toned-down way. And again it can be said that, although rivalry groups and contradictory hopes and experiences lie at the heart of the revolt, it made the movement neither distinct from nor identical with prophecy or apocalypticism, at least at first sight.

When one looks at the Maccabean Revolt from a religion- and tradition-historical point of view then, one needs to compare those writings that reflect the ideas underlying the Maccabean uprising and ask whether they represent prophetic and apocalyptic genres and apocalyptic modes of thinking. How do the books and passages in writings tied to the Maccabees, such as 1 and 2 Maccabees, 1 Enoch 90, Daniel 2–7, and *Assumption of Moses* 8–10, treat such topics as the origin of evil, salvation, and the time of redemption? Prophetic literature sees the human heart as the origin of evil, salvation as something coming from God, when man repents, and the time of redemption tied to the Day of the Lord, but very much being part of this world, whereas apocalyptic literature clearly states that the fallen angels brought evil into the world, that salvation is something that comes from outside, and that the time of redemption is at the calculated end of this world and the beginning of the world to come. In other words, we are dealing with quite different concepts of anthropology, theology, and view of world history.

The problem is, however, first a question of the sources, second that the aforementioned books and chapters present both points of view—apocalyptic and prophetic, and third that the Maccabean Revolt may have been an event that was caused by a combination of different mindsets. The more apocalypticism is understood as having emerged from a wide variety of social matrices and having been

publication on *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition* by E. P. Sanders et al. (1980), research made little progress until the end of the twentieth century and was mainly limited on the one hand to the first century CE and on the other hand to canonical writings. See now also Fabian E. Udoh et al. (eds) *Redefining First-Century Jewish and Christian Identities: Essays in Honor of Ed Parish Sanders* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2008). "Religious identity" enters the scholarly debate at different intersections: it is either static and pre-supposed, in constant flux or a-historical, or it depends on the definition, constantly changes, and is a product of twentieth-century anachronism. Insofar as it belongs to the three key issues of race, religion, and gender, it belongs to a whole complex of social identifications.

19. See the discussion in Lester L. Grabbe, "Prophetic and Apocalyptic: Time for New Definitions – and New Thinking," in L. Grabbe et al., *Knowing the End*, 106–33, esp. 109–14.

under the inspiration of different kinds of religious leaders, instead of stemming from the socially and economically deprived classes and the marginal and socially alienated figures, as favored in the crisis theory, the more it becomes obvious that the apocalyptic worldview may have been much more widespread in the third and second centuries BCE and therefore also more central to the Maccabean uprising or even already among the powerful early Second Temple period Zadokite movement than previously thought. However, much depends on the evaluation of the sources—in other words, those writings reflecting the Maccabean Revolt. Let us therefore have a look at these sources, and how they looked back, from a reception-historical point of view, at the events that led to the uprising.

2. Writings reflecting on the Maccabean Revolt

If we now want to describe the impact of apocalypticism on the events that led to and formed the Maccabean Revolt in more detail and from the perspective of the authors closest to it, we need to look at two genres of books: apocalyptic and historical. Several of these come into question here, such 1 Enoch, Daniel, *Assumption of Moses* on the one hand and 1 and 2 Maccabees on the other hand. Whereas in the mentioned apocalyptic writings we need to distill historical facts from the features typical of the genre, such as visions and heavenly journeys, secret or cryptic language, apocalyptic worldview, etc., in the case of the factual information, letters, documents, and chronology provided by the authors of 1 and 2 Maccabees, we also need to be sensitive about their perspective towards and view of this history, which was portrayed from the point of view and in favour of the Hasmonean rulers, who had commissioned the authoring of 1 and 2 Maccabees. In all cases we may be able to distinguish social and political facts from literary constructions and rhetorical strategies, although any historian knows that precisely this distinction is the most difficult of all undertakings. In the following we will, nevertheless, try to give an overview of the historical events that form the basic momentum of the Maccabean Revolt, both from the perspective of 1 and 2 Maccabees and of 1 Enoch, *Third Sibylline Oracles Book*, Daniel, and *Assumption of Moses*.

2.1. The Maccabean Revolt as described in 1 and 2 Maccabees

To begin with 1 and 2 Maccabees, the fact that both books were written one or two generations after the Maccabean uprising BCE points to two important historiographic characteristics as regards both.[20] First, their authors have made use

20. Introductions to 1 and 2 Maccabees are found in H. W. Attridge, "Jewish Historiography," in R. A. Kraft and G. W. E. Nickelsburg (eds), *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1986), 311–43 (history and state of research), and H. W. Attridge, "Historiography," in M. E. Stone et al. (eds), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (CRINT 11.2; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984), 157–84; Schürer, *The History of*

of older sources unknown to us (see 2 Macc. 2:19-32), as they are well informed about the history of the Jewish people and know many details concerning the conflict with the Syrian rulers at the beginning of the second century BCE. Second, they had not only the opportunity but also a reason to give an apologetic portrayal of the events connected with the Maccabees, as they wrote during (and, especially in the case of 1 Maccabees, in favour of) Hasmonean rule.

In the centre of 1 Maccabees, an apologetic history of those events from 333 to 135 BCE leading to the Maccabean Revolt, stands the priestly family of Mattathias and his sons, their resistance against the Syrian occupation after a Syrian effort to abolish the Mosaic religion.[21] Behind it stands the unshakable trust in God's protection of his people and the centrality of Jerusalem. The narrative seems designed to be taken as credible and reliable, evidenced by its many details and its adoption of a style similar to that adopted by "sacred history" in the Hebrew Bible (to the Greek version of which it was added quite early).

Of central importance for the portrayal of history in 2 Maccabees, written around 124 BCE and less favourable towards the Hasmoneans, is God's miraculous action in history. This stands in contrast to 1 Maccabees, which highlights the military skills and political wisdom of the Maccabees. The author of 2 Maccabees, who presents himself as the epitomist of a five-volume history on Judas written by Jason of Cyrene, clearly belongs to the epoch of Hellenistic Judaism. Although he probably lived in Alexandria, the connection with the Palestinian homeland was of central importance to him. The fact that the author made use of an older, though lost, work not only indicates that in the case of 2 Maccabees we are dealing with a description, but also with an interpretation of the events resulting in the Maccabean Revolt. Despite the importance of the literary sources and their redaction by the author of 2 Maccabees, we can only take the book in its present state as the basis of our investigations.[22]

After two introductory chapters, 2 Maccabees 3–7 treats the time before the Maccabean uprising in great detail and focuses on the inner-Jewish conflicts concerning the high-priesthood and the martyrdom of the faithful, whereas 2 Maccabees 8–15 presents the events described in 1 Maccabees 1:11–7:50 in a different order. Due to its character, 2 Maccabees is less historical than 1 Maccabees, if one considers only the *bruta facta*, but it nevertheless gives us

the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ, 180–5, as well as in Lehnardt, *Bibliographie*, and H. Lichtenberger, U. Mittmann-Richert, and G. S. Oegema (eds), *Einleitung zu den jüdischen Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer zeit* (JSHRZ, VI. 1; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlag Gerd Mohn, 2000).

21. The sixteen chapters of the book contain several references to older literary sources as well as many documents (letters, decrees, and treaties), and were most probably written in Jerusalem. The author presumes to represent a "traditional" Jewish standpoint on the dominant form of Palestinian by stressing both the legal hegemony of the Hasmonean priest-kings as well as Jewish patriotism and national independence.

22. Concerning the sources, see also the letters in 2 Macc. 1:1-9, 1:10-2:18, and 9:19-27, as well as the documents mentioned in 2 Macc. 11:17-21, 23-26, 27-33, and 6:34-38.

important insights into the way the Maccabean Revolt, the events leading to it, and the situation resulting from it were perceived in those days. For instance, the author of 2 Maccabees blames inner Jewish conflicts (mainly Jason's and Menelaus's striving for the high-priesthood and the Hellenization of Judea) for the abolishment of the Jewish religion by Antiochus IV.

As a whole, it seems that 1 and 2 Maccabees have more in common with the historiographic writings of the Hebrew Bible, both the pre- and post-exilic ones, than apocalypticism or even prophecy, as far as their genre and theology are concerned. The authors clearly tried to imitate the genre and show familiarity with the theology, which we can label as Deuteronomistic theology but also a theology similar to the one found in Ezra and Nehemiah. Apocalyptic ideas are few and mostly found in 2 Maccabees, both in its language and in its ideas. To the latter we may count the whole complex of ideas found at the end of 2 Maccabees 7:29-38, a theologically highly innovative passage about the immortality of the soul, the rewards and punishments, and the resurrection at the end of days, with an impact decisive for the development of Early Judaism (and Early Christianity) and an origin akin to apocalyptic ideas.

However, these ideas are presented with such a confidence that they must have been an integral part of Jewish thinking in those days, at least of some groups, and still, in the days just prior to the Maccabean Revolt, they must have been relatively new or even unheard of; at least we don't hear of them prior to 175 BCE. These ideas must have circulated before they were written down between 161 BCE, the approximate date of the five-volume work of Jason of Cyrene, and 124 BCE, the approximate date of its later summary 2 Maccabees. This is the period during which the Teacher of Righteousness left Jerusalem in order to found the Essene Community. And if 2 Maccabees is in less close proximity to the Hasmoneans than 1 Maccabees, it also reveals that these ideas were held by some followers of the Maccabees. The latter is confirmed by the following apocalyptic writings.[23]

2.2. The Maccabean Revolt as described in 1 Enoch, Third Sibylline Oracles, Jesus Sirach, Daniel, and Assumption of Moses

2.2.1. *1 Enoch 90*

In 1 Enoch 90:6-38, written between 165 and 161 BCE, we see the use of symbolic and mythological language, the complete eschaton revealed in a vision, a life setting that reflects on the relevance of the Maccabean Revolt for the people behind 1 Enoch, and a clear connection between Enochic Jews and the Maccabean Revolt.[24] As for the use of symbolic and mythological language, we

23. See on these passages also Gerbern S. Oegema, *The Anointed and His People. Messianic Expectations from the Maccabees to Bar Kochba* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha, Vol. 27) (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998).

24. Ephraim Isaac, "1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch", in James H. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha,* Vol. 1–2 (Garden City: Doubleday, 1983–1985), Vol. 1, 5–89.

are dealing here with animal image or zoomorphic language, which, while it is clearly symbolic, may after all not be mythological. In 1 Enoch 85:3–90:16 as a whole, the history of Israel is retold from the time of creation until the end of days. In 85:3–89:9 the time from the Creation until the Flood is retold and a white bull symbolizes Adam; in 89:10-27 it is the period from Noah to the Exodus, in 89:28–40 from the wandering of the people of Israel through the desert, the revelation of the Torah to the entry into Palestine, in 89:41-50 from the Judges to the First Temple, in 89:51-67 from the Kings of Israel until the Destruction of the Temple, in 89:68-71 from the Destruction until the Return from Exile, in 89:72-77 from Cyrus the Great to Alexander the Great, in 90:1-5 from Alexander to the Seleucids, and in 90:6-19 until the Maccabean Revolt.

In 90:6–12 lambs are crying to deafened sheep, one of the lambs is eaten by ravens. Finally, a horn grows out of one of the sheep and rams run to this horned sheep. Eagles, vultures, ravens, and kites are now eating the sheep, with only the rams crying aloud, but then being attacked by the ravens. In 90:13-19 shepherds are arriving and the vultures, kites, and ravens now try to smash the horn of the ram, but they start battling each other and the crying out of the ram reaches the Lord of the sheep. This then marks the turning point in 90:15-19, as revealed by the man who writes down everything (90:14 and 17), as the Lord of the sheep leads now the sheep in battle and the beasts and birds of heaven are chased away. What follows is a description of a judgement scene in heaven with a clearly more mythological content (90:20-38), as it involves images of the throne of God, sealed books, a Hades-like fiery abyss, only with the paradise or heaven as a place of reward being replaced by a temple.[25]

Whereas not all details are intelligible, and understanding the passage is also obscured by its various redactional stages, the main picture is clear: Israel, symbolized by the lambs, is surrounded by enemies, symbolized mostly by various birds, notably the ravens. The most likely historical context is that of the end of the third century and the first decades of the second century BCE controlled by the Ptolemies and Seleucides, with the horned ram being Judas Maccabeus, the lambs the people of Israel, the sheep standing for the priests, and the ravens being the Syrians. The vision represents the author's expectation about the eschaton including the final days of history as it had arrived in his own days, a latter-day battle, and a judgement scene in heaven, with punishments in hell, and the rebuilding of the temple (in 90:20-38) and the central role the Maccabees played in it.

However, the heavenly judgement scene is not expected for the end of days, but is described in such a way that it reveals the author's interpretation of what was happening in his own days with the rededication of the temple and the reign of the Hasmoneans. The life setting behind 1 Enoch 90 thus clearly shows the relevance the Maccabean Revolt and Judas Maccabeus (the horned ram) has for the people behind 1 Enoch (the lambs and the sheep). The connection between

25. See on the messianic figure in this passage Oegema, *Anointed*, 67–9.

Judas and his followers is so close that verses 9–10 see the horned ram as coming forth from the sheep:

> Then I kept seeing till one great horn sprouted on one of those sheep, and he opened their eyes, and they had vision in them and their eyes were opened. He cried aloud to the sheep, and all the rams saw him and ran unto him.

Whereas the sheep are most probably the priests in the temple of Jerusalem, the function of the horned ram, who clearly comes out of the sheep and is therefore a priest himself, is both royal and military (he is a powerful leader, whom the people follow), visionary and educational (he has a vision of how things will be and is listened to).

Whether 1 Enoch 90 was written and therefore reflects a period prior to the Maccabean Revolt or whether its final edition looks back at the events from later perspective, in both cases we may assume that the connection between Jews of the Enochic tradition and the Maccabees was such, that Enochic Judaism embraced Judas Maccabeus as one of them and his revolt as stemming from their very own apocalyptic ideas (i.e. the "sealed books" in 90:20?). We can even go one step further and call this depiction an example of realized eschatology, as the eschaton had been fulfilled in the time of the Hasmonean reign. The main arguments for this are, first, that the punishments are only meant for the "stars" and the "70 shepherds" that have tried to kill the sheep, a clear indication that the enemies of Israel (without and within) are meant; and second, that the paradise or heaven as a place of reward, found in other parts of 1 Enoch (1 Enoch 1–5; 85–90) as well as in other later apocalypses, seems to have been replaced by the rededicated temple—the scene with the temple is placed prior to the beginning of the messianic reign. The latter opens up the possibility that the end of 1 Enoch 90 originally may have consisted of only a punishment in hell scene and a reward in heaven scene and that later the temple scene was placed in between both scenes. However, given the suggested date as surrounding the Maccabean Revolt, we may be dealing with a very close and authentic reflection on the events.

2.2.2. *Sibylline Oracles 3:767–808*

We have a parallel to this example of realized eschatology in 1 Enoch 90: an actualization placed in between a prior existing tradition, namely in the *Third Sibylline Oracles Book*, written between 163 and 145, especially in 3.767–808. In this passage the Egyptian king Ptolemy VI or VII is hailed as a latter-day liberator, who as "the king from the sun" will come, bring wars to an end, and obey God's teaching (3.652–656), but only against the background of a more theocratic situation, in which it is God Himself who will establish a kingdom among the pious and bring forth His kingdom, where prophets will rule as judges and kings. In detail, God will come to bring a cosmic judgement (3.689–701) after an attack on the temple in Jerusalem (3.657–686), save the elected (3.702–731), punish the sinful heathens (3.732–740), and then bring peace and prosperity to the world (3.741–761) as the beginning of God's kingdom

(3.767–795). As such, the passage is an actualized interpretation of Isaiah 11:1–16, closely following the structure of Isaiah 11:1–12, quoting almost ad verbatim Isaiah 11:6–9 (the passage about the new paradise) and interpreting Isaiah 11:1–5 and 10–12 in an actualizing and allegorical way. Overall, the popular prophetic passage of Isaiah 11 is used to present the vision of the author of a realized eschatology for the Jews in Ptolemaic Egypt in the first half of the second century BCE.[26]

2.2.3. *Jesus Sirach 51*

A further example of realized eschatology, which to a lesser degree also constitutes a parallel, is from the pre-Maccabean Book of Ben Sira. Also here, in chapters 46–51, we can find an example of realized eschatology, especially when at the end of Ben Sira's retelling of the history of Biblical Israel (with Torah and Wisdom at its centre) he arrives in his own days and praises the high priest Simon in the highest tones and describes him as the sun, moon, and stars, when he fulfils in full high priestly robes the service of the temple on the day of Yom Kippur. In the closing verse 50:24 the hope is expressed that God will keep His covenant with Phinehas and preserve it for his seed "for ever," as the Hebrew version of Ben Sira from around the time of 190–175 BCE formulates, comparing Simon with the celestial bodies.

Hope for an eternal priesthood, however, has disappeared in the Septuagint version of Ben Sira 50:24 from around the time of 132 BCE and a more general prayer has been added to it. At the end of the second century BCE the Hasmoneans had taken over the priesthood from the descendants of Phinehas, with the apparent result that their followers and sympathizers responsible for the Greek edition of Ben Sira saw no need any more to express this hope for an eternal priesthood, as the Hasmoneans had become the guarantee of the priesthood.

2.2.4. *Daniel 2 and 7*

In the book of Daniel 2 and 7, clearly situated and written in the fatal years of 168–164 BCE, we find both the view of history of the author (or authors) and the expectation of its final end. In the portrayal of history the four consecutive kingdoms, symbolized by four metals and four animals, play a major role in suppressing Israel, with the fourth kingdom being the worst. At the end of eschaton of this periodized history an angelic and human-like figure will play a liberating role. The orientation of both chapters, as of the whole book of Daniel, is anti-Seleucidic, its social setting most probably that of the Hasidim; its theological message is that at the end of days, God's judgement will be executed through the hands of His representative.[27]

26. See Oegema, *Anointed*, 81–5.

27. See in more detail Oegema, *Anointed*, 55–67. As for the Septuagint version of Daniel, we may point to a study by J. Lust on messianism in the Septuagint, in which he notices that some passages with an eschatological tendency in the Hebrew Bible version of the MT have received an actualizing one in the LXX, so, for example, in Dan. 9:25-26;

Central in the Apocalypse's response to the events prior to and during the Maccabean Revolt are the traditions of the Fathers, the People of God, and the One Like a Man as God's representative, with the ancestral traditions being opposed to the perversion of the Torah, the People of God—clearly a reference to the Hasidaic circles—opposed to Hellenism and the Jewish Hellenists, and the One Like a Man opposed to Menelaos, who had been appointed by Antiochus IV. The One Like a Man is most likely an angelic figure, who symbolizes God's representation on earth and represents divine liberation. Finally, we cannot go into the various redactional stages of Daniel 2:4–7:27 as well as the additional chapters 8–12, all from the period 200–140 BCE with a concentration on the years 175–164 BCE.[28]

To keep it short, Daniel 2–7 represents the events that led to the Maccabean Revolt as well as the revolt itself in light of its larger view of history, in which the four empires represent stages in the apocalyptic and eschatological attacks on Israel leading to a time of divine intervention and judgement, in which both God's representative on earth and the pious within Israel play a decisive role. The language employed in Daniel 2–7 is both apocalyptic and mythological, but in Daniel 8–12 it is also historical and explanatory. As a whole, the book of Daniel is a very close and condensed reflection on the historical situation and intellectual mood before and after the Maccabean uprising.

2.2.5. *Assumption of Moses 8–10*

In the *Assumption of Moses* 8–10[29] we find a confirmation of the expectation of an end of history and the coming of a latter-day judgement at a time when the people of God are persecuted in ways clearly reminiscent of the events leading to the Maccabean Revolt (Ass.Mos. 8:1–5; with details found in 2 Macc. 7). This then leads to the expectation of a "man from the tribe of Levi, whose name is Taxo" (9:1), who will speak earnestly to his seven sons about the great punishment befalling on the people (9:2–3), caused by them transgressing God's commandments (9:4). He then decided to fast with his sons, go into a cave in the open country and "rather die than transgress the commandments of the Lord of Lords, the God of our fathers" (9:5–7). This is a brief and most accurate description of Judas Maccabeus on the eve of the uprising, both of their actions and their motivations.

Chapter 10 then describes their victory in a long hymn of praise to God (10:1–10). However, the hymn is so poetic in language that there are hardly any allusions to historical events of groups, so that it is difficult to connect Ass. Mos. 8–10 to any group or movement within Judaism other than to a group of admirers of the Maccabees. It does, however, show a clear connection between

see Oegema, *Anointed*, 63 and J. Lust, "Messianism and Septuagint," in J.A. Emerton (ed.), *Congress Volume: Salamance 1983* (VTSup, 36; Leiden: Brill, 1985), 174–91, esp. 176–7.

28. See further in Oegema, *Anointed*, 55–67.

29. J. Priest, "Testament of Moses", in James H. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha,* Vols. 1–2 (Garden City: Doubleday, 1983–5), Vol. 1, 919–34.

the apocalyptic mindset of the days and the Maccabees: the Maccabean Revolt is understood to have taken place at the end of a history of sins and transgressions and the beginning of a new era, and the Maccabees are seen as incremental in this transition.

3. Conclusion

When we now bring together all different points of view and try to formulate an overall hypothesis, it may look as follows:

- the Maccabean Revolt reflects, according to 1 and 2 Maccabees, clear opinions about the law and ethics, there is a strong hasidaeic/essenic connection, as well as a relevance for Jewish (religious?) identity.
- the Maccabean Revolt rested upon the clear conviction that the Jewish nation was and should be in the hands of those who worshipped the one true God and followed His commandments, and that they had all reasons to be proud and self-confident leaders of the Jews, whether they were the very masculine warriors the Maccabees (1 Maccabees), or whether they were more soft-spoken and persevering, such as the mother of the seven sons (2 Maccabees 7), willing to sacrifice the lives of her sons and herself.
- the Maccabean Revolt was clearly intellectually prepared by a preceding common (and/or suddenly acute?) apocalyptic worldview, as expressed in 1 Enoch 90 and Daniel 2 and 7, and confirmed by the *Third Sibylline Oracles Book* and the *Assumption of Moses* 8–10.
- the Maccabean Revolt entertained or even initiated a central apocalyptic complex of ideas about the immortality of the soul, the rewards and punishments after death, and a resurrection at the end of days.
- the Maccabean Revolt was, according to the authors of some writings (1 Enoch 90; see also *Sibylline Oracles* 3.767–808; compare Jesus Sirach 51), considered to be an example of realized eschatology.
- the Maccabean Revolt was socially embedded in the various and different groups behind these aforementioned writings that were partly of a Zadokite origin, Hasidaeic origin, or other origin.
- the Maccabean Revolt itself was led by prophetically inspired members of the priestly class, who as individuals stood at the head of a reform movement that wanted to restore elements of the monarchy and priesthood in Israel from a Deuteronomistic point of view, namely with the observance of the Law and the emphasis of Jewish ethics as the only criteria and *conditio sine qua non*.
- the Maccabean Revolt was a movement contrary to the reactions of other groups (with a partly very different intellectual orientation, hopes, and experiences) in response to the growing Hellenistic culture, most of all contrary to the Hellenists, who since the third century BCE had developed a very positive attitude towards Hellenism (see also the Tobiads).
- the Maccabean Revolt did lead to some new symbolic language (see, for

example, the animal language in 1 Enoch 90 and the symbolic images of metal and animals in Daniel 2 and 7), but that did not change the core of the movement, as the "symbols" were mainly employed for rhetorical and strategic reasons.

Bibliography

Adams, Samuel L. (2008), *Wisdom in Transition. Act and Consequence in Second Temple Instructions* (Leiden: Brill).

Albertz, R. (1994), *A History of Israelite Religion in the Old TestamentPeriod, Volume II: From the Exile to the Maccabees* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press).

Attridge, Harald W. (1986), "Jewish Historiography," in R. A. Kraft and G. W. E. Nickelsburg (eds), *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters* (Atlanta: Scholars), 311–43.

Attridge, Harald W. (1984), "Historiography," in M. E. Stone et al. (eds), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (CRINT 11.2; Assen: Van Gorcum), 157–84;Schürer, Emil, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, 180–5, as well as inBerquist, Jon L. (ed.) (2008), *Approaching Yehud. New Approaches to the Study of the Persian Period* (Leiden: Brill).

Boccaccini, G. (1998), *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways Between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).

Boccaccini, G. and J. J. Collins (eds) (2007), *The Early Enoch Literature* (Leiden: Brill).

Charles, R. H. (1913), *A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future life, in Israel, in Judaism, and in Christianity, or, Hebrew, Jewish, and Christian Eschatology from Pre-prophetic Times till the Close of the New Testament Canon*, 2nd edn (London: A & C Black).

Collins, J. J. (ed.) (1979), *Apocalypse. The Morphology of a Genre* (Missoula: Scholars Press).

Collins, J. J., B. McGinn, and J. S. Stein (eds) (1999), *The Encylopedia of Apocalypticism: Vol. I: The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity* (New York: Continuum).

Cook, S. L. (1995), *Prophecy and Apocalypticism: The Postexilic Setting* (Minneapolis: Fortress).

Grabbe, Lester L. (1992), *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian*, 2 vols (Minneapolis: Fortress).

Grabbe, Lester L. (2000), *Judaic Religion in the Second Temple Period: Belief and Practice from the Exile to Yavneh* (London: Routledge).

Grabbe, Lester and Robert D. Haak (eds) (2003), *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, Apocalyptic and their Relationships* (London: T&T Clark).

Gunkel, H. (1895), *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit: eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung über Gen 1 und Ap Joh 12. Mit Beiträgen von Heinrich Zimmern* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Hanson, P. D. (1979), *The Dawn of Apocalyptic: The Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology*, rev. edn (Philadelphia: Fortress).

Hellholm, D. (1989), *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and in the Near East*, 2nd edn (Tübingen: Mohr).

Hogeterp, Albert L. A. (2008), *Expectations of the End. A Comparative Traditio-Historical Study of Eschatological, Apocalyptic and Messianic Ideas in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament* (Leiden: Brill).

Isaac, Ephraim, "1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch", in James H. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha,* Vol. 1–2 (Garden City: Doubleday, 1983–5), Vol. 1, 5–89.
Kaiser, Otto (2002), "Politische und persönliche Freiheit im jüdisch-hellenistischen Schrifttum des 2. Jh.s. v. Chr.," in Hermann Lichtenberger and Gerbern S. Oegema (eds), *Die Jüdischen Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit in ihrem antik-jüdischen und neutestamentlichen Kontext* (Studien zu den Jüdischen Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit, Vol. 1) (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus), 43º58.
Koch, K. (1970), *Ratlos vor der Apokalyptik: eine Streitschrift über ein vernachlässigtes Gebiet der Bibelwissenschaft und die schädlichen Auswirkungen auf Theologie und Philosophie* (Gütersloh: Mohn).
Levine, Lee I. and Daniel R. Schwartz (eds) (2009), *Jewish Identities in Antiquity. Studies in Memory of Menahem Stern* (Tübingen: Mohr).
Lieu, Judith (2004), *Christian Identity in the Jewish and Graeco-Roman World* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press).
Martin Hogan, Karina (2008), *Theologies in Conflict in 4 Ezra. Wisdom Debate and Apocalyptic Solution* (Leiden: Brill).
Macaskill, Grant (2007), *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (Leiden: Brill).
Oegema, Gerbern S. (1998), *The Anointed and His People. Messianic Expectations from the Maccabees to Bar Kochba* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha, Vol. 27) (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
Oegema, Gerbern S. (1999), *Zwischen Hoffnung und Gericht. Untersuchungen zur Rezeption der Apokalyptik im frühen Christentum und Judentum* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlagshaus).
Oegema, Gerbern S. (2001), *Apokalypsen* (JSHRZ-Supplementa, Vol. VI.1.5) (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus).
Oegema, Gerbern S. (2008), "Back to the Future in the Early Church: The Use of the Book of Daniel in Early Patristic Eschatology," in Patricia Kirkpatrick et al. (eds), *The Function of Ancient Historiography* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark), 186–98.
Oegema, Gerbern S. (2012), "The Heritage of Jewish Apocalypticism in Late-Antique and Early Medieval Judaism, Christianity and Islam," in R. Wisnovsky et al. (eds), *Vehicles of Transmission, Translation, and Transformation in Medieval Cultures* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press), 103–29.
Plöger, O. (1965), *Das Buch Daniel* (Gütersloh: Mohn).
Reuss, E. (1892), *Die Propheten* (Braunschweig: Schwetschke).
Rowland, Ch. (1982), *The Open Heaven: a Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (New York: Crossroad).
Sanders, E. P. (ed.) (2007), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition* (Philadelphia: Fortress).
Sandwell, I. (2007), *Religious Identity in Late Antiquity: Greeks, Jews and Christians in Antioch* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
Schafer, P. (1998), *Judeophobia: Attitudes toward the Jews in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
Schmidt, J. J. (1976), *Die jüdische Apokalyptik. Die Geschichte ihrer Erforschung von den Anfangen bis zu den Textfunden von Qumran*, 2nd edn (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag).
Sweeney, Marvin A. and Ehud Ben Zvi (eds) (2003), *The Changing Face of Form-Criticism for the Twenty-First Century* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).
Udoh, Fabian E. et al. (eds) (2008), *Redefining First-Century Jewish and Christian*

Identities: Essays in Honor of Ed Parish Sanders (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press).
VanderKam, J. C. and W. Adler (1996), *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity* (Assen/Minneapolis: Van Gorcum/Fortress).
Yoshiko Reed, A. (2005), *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature* (New York: Cambridge University Press).

Response to Oegema

Lorenzo DiTommaso

In this stimulating and wide-ranging paper, Gerbern S. Oegema asks whether the Maccabean Revolt was an apocalyptic movement, a prophetic movement, or something else. My response, necessarily brief, offers a few methodological observations in view of his proposals.

1. Approaches to Apocalypticism

In the first section of his paper, Oegema reviews six scholarly approaches to the question of the "nature and essence" of apocalypticism during the Maccabean Revolt.[1] His survey is distinguished by its broad coverage and balanced tenor, and by the fact that every approach it includes defines apocalypticism in relation to biblical prophecy.[2] The last point is significant, since two other "approaches," both proceeding from the assumption that early Jewish apocalypticism emerged from a crucible containing other elements besides prophecy, might also have been documented.

One approach is represented by studies that actively seek to isolate these other elements. Many authorities, for example, have detected parallels between early apocalyptic literature and ancient Zoroastrianism.[3] Other scholars have focused on wisdom, whether in its biblical or Second-Temple forms, or in the mantic traditions of the Ancient Near East, including oneiromancy and divination. Still others have identified points of contact between apocalyptic phenomena and Mesopotamian incantation texts, predictive writings, and astronomical lore.[4]

1. These six approaches are also discussed in Oegema's insightful study, "Early Christianity in Its Jewish Context: A Brief Look at 20th Century Research," in J. W. van Henten and J. Verheyden (eds), *Early Christian Ethics in Interaction with Jewish and Greco-Roman Contexts* (STAR 17; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2013), 31–51.

2. According to Oegema, this approach emerged only in 1990. Mediaevalists would likely disagree, given their longstanding appreciation of the role of ancient apocalyptic texts and traditions in shaping mediaeval culture. For sources, see L. DiTommaso, "Apocalypticism, Millennialism, and Messianism," in P. E. Szarmach (ed.), *Medieval Studies* (Oxford Bibliographies Online, www.oxfordbibliographiesonline.com: Oxford University Press).

3. The medieval Iranian literature is expertly outlined in P. O. Skjærvø, "Zoroastrian Dualism," in A. Lange et al. (eds), *Light Against Darkness: Dualism in Ancient Mediterranean Religion and the Contemporary World* (JAJS 2; Göttingen and Oakville, CT: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2011), 55–91.

4. The literature is substantial. For sources, see J. J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (Cambridge and Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 1–42.

The other approach is represented by studies that have attempted to set the study of apocalypticism and related phenomena on sound taxonomical ground. This task is foundational in its scope: all other approaches are informed by its results. Oegema mentions Klaus Koch, Paul D. Hanson, John J. Collins, and Lester L. Grabbe, but does not detail the meaning and centrality of their work, especially that of Collins.

Each approach inflected the other. The search for the origins of the apocalyptic worldview beyond the prophetic matrix arose in part from the recognition that some early Jewish apocalypses were concerned with more than the meaning of history and its end.[5] At the same time, the results of this search prompted a reevaluation of the relationship of apocalypticism to other phenomena, particularly wisdom and divinatory literature.[6]

The effect of both approaches has been transformative. Forty years ago, early "apocalyptic" was widely regarded to have developed directly from biblical prophecy. This view was based on a series of interlocking presumptions. The book of Daniel was considered to be the earliest apocalypse. Its vivid and symbolic imagery, dualistic view of the world, attention to history and historical events, and revelation of an imminent and divinely engineered reversal of fortune were assumed to be the core features of apocalyptic literature as a class.[7] Some of these features were also recognized among the prophetic books. Other features were thought to have evolved out of the prophetic matrix (e.g. the prophetic expectation for the Day of the Lord was seen as containing the germ of what would become the apocalyptic anticipation for the end of days). Thus the development of the apocalyptic worldview was envisioned in terms of a trajectory, which began with the visions and oracles of the classical Israelite prophets Isaiah and Jeremiah, and carried on through the exilic and post-exilic prophets such as Ezekiel, Joel, and Zechariah, which were designated "proto-apocalyptic" to indicate their mid-point status on the road from prophecy to apocalypticism, inasmuch as they seemed to display qualities of both. Scholars proposed social settings that explained this trajectory.[8] Sometimes these proposals allowed for the influence of Zoroastrianism. Always they depended on a notion of apocalypses as the

5. M. E. Stone, "Lists of Revealed Things in the Apocalyptic Literature," in F. M. Cross et al. (eds), *Magnalia Dei, the Mighty Acts of God: Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Memory of G. Ernest Wright* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976), 414–35.

6. Recently, L. L. Grabbe and R. D. Haak (eds), *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic and Their Relationships* (JSPSup 46; London/New York, 2003).

7. The Enochic *Apocalypse of Weeks* and *Animal Apocalypse* are of the same vintage as the apocalyptic visions of Daniel, and exhibit the same features.

8. Among the first of such studies are P. D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic: The Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology* (Philadelphia, 1975), idem, "Apocalypse, Genre," and "Apocalypticism," *Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible, Supplementary Volume* (ed. K. Crim; Nashville: Abingdon, 1976), 27–34, and W. R. Millar, *Isaiah 24-27 and the Origin of Apocalyptic* (HSM 11; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976). More would follow.

literary expression of marginalised groups in conflict with a dominant class or an oppressive ruling power.

Most of these views now can no longer stand without modification. Research on apocalypticism in other centuries and different cultures has amply demonstrated the worldview's ability to take root in social settings besides those involving small sectarian groups.[9] It is also clear that the primitive Enochic writings, such as the *Astronomical Book* and the earliest parts of the *Book of Watchers*, are appreciably older than the apocalyptic visions of Daniel, yet unlike Daniel they focus on cosmology, otherworldly journeys, and the origin of evil more than the end of history. The *Aramaic Levi Document*, 4QInstruction, and 4QBirth of Noah similarly contain other kinds of information in an eschatological framework. The point is that none of these compositions really has a genetic ancestor in biblical prophecy, nor can they be explained as having evolved from the prophetic matrix. Such points of contact and lines of influence can only be explained in the context of the traditions of the broader Ancient Near Eastern world.

2. Writings Reflecting on the Maccabean Revolt

In the second section of his paper, Oegema examines the impact of apocalypticism on the causes and conduct of the Maccabean Revolt. His investigation is undertaken with reference to the contemporary sources, which he divides into "two genres of books, apocalyptic and historical ones." The apocalyptic books are 1 Enoch 90, *Sibylline Oracle* 3.767–808, Sirach 51, Daniel 2 and 7, and the *Assumption of Moses* 8–10. Oegema devotes special attention to the importance of realised eschatology in these writings. The historical books are 1 and 2 Maccabees. Here Oegema highlights the depictions of God's action in history, and how these books take their inspiration from the Hebrew Bible's historiographic literature instead of its prophetic-apocalyptic tradition. He is also sensitive to passages that seem to pick up on apocalyptic themes, such as 2 Maccabees 7:29-38.

Oegema's treatment of the sources is brisk, systematic, and insightful. It represents a novel way of appreciating the sources. But certain points of its methodology might be sharpened. The decision to divide the sources according to genre raises several issues. For example, the name of the formal literary genre is "apocalypse," not "apocalyptic."[10] *Sibylline Oracle* 3 is not an apocalypse: it is an apocalyptic oracle. Likewise, Daniel 2 and Sirach 51 are not apocalypses, nor are they apocalyptic (see below). The point is not insignificant. Terminological conflation tends to result in methodological confusion, which recalls the state of research on apocalypticism as it existed forty years ago. Apocalypses (the genre) and apocalyptic (the adjective referring to the worldview) are related but not

9. See, e.g. B. McGinn, *Visions of the End: Apocalyptic Traditions in the Middle Ages* (expanded edn; New York: Columbia University Press, 1998), esp. 28–9, on "imperial apocalypticism."

10. Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 4–5.

identical terms. Asking the same questions of both will not always return the same answers.

Also, it is not certain whether one can actually speak of a historical "genre," a term that I did not encounter in a brief consultation of the authoritative works on the study and writing of history.[11] Instead, there is a general consensus that history is a discipline, not a genre; that historiography is the writing of history; and that the historical method involves the critical evaluation of the record of human events (taking into account the biases of the historian and his age). The historiography of 1 Maccabees differs in type from the historiography of the *Animal Apocalypse* and the visions of the second half of Daniel; perhaps a formal distinction can be drawn on that basis. But to classify "history" as a genre and differentiate it from "apocalyptic" is to imply that apocalyptic literature is unconcerned with history, when it is—and profoundly so.[12] The expectation that the present age will shortly come to an end is axiomatic to apocalypticism. It imbues the worldview with a historical dimension which, to a greater or lesser degree, appears in all its literary expressions. What is the review of history in Daniel 7 if not an illustration of an *apocalyptic* historiography?

The claim for the apocalyptic nature of Daniel 2 is less certain, however, as is its value as a record of the events of the Maccabean Revolt. Here my view diverges from that of Oegema's. Like the other court tales of Daniel 2–6, Daniel 2 is definitely pre-Maccabean and almost certainly pre-Seleucid.[13] Its historical review,

11. M. Bloch, *The Historian's Craft* (trans. P. Putnam; New York: Vintage, 1953), E. H. Carr, *What Is History?* (New York: Vintage, 1961), J. Ortega y Gasset, *History as a System and Other Essays toward a Philosophy of History* (New York: Norton, 1961), J. Burckhardt, *On History and Historians* (trans. H. Zohn; New York: Harper, 1965), T. R. Tholfsen, *Historical Thinking* (New York: Harper & Row 1967), A. D. Momigliano, *Studies in Historiography* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1969), M. I. Finley, *The Use and Abuse of History* (London: The Hogarth Press, 1986), P. Novick (ed.), *That Noble Dream: The "Objectivity Question" and the American Historical Profession* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), G. G. Iggers, *Historiography in the Twentieth Century: From Scientific Objectivity to the Postmodern Challenge* (Hanover/London: Wesleyan University Press, 1997), A. Green and K. Troup (eds), *The Houses of History: A Critical Reader in Twentieth-Century History and Theory* (New York: New York University Press, 1999), and R. J. Evans, *In Defense of History* (New York/London: Norton, 1999). I have not indicated dates of first publication or the languages in which some of these works initially appeared.

12. See, e.g. R. W. Southern, "Aspects of the European Tradition of Historical Writing: 3. History as Prophecy," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 22, 5th series (1972): 159–80, P. Magdalino, "The History of the Future and Its Uses: Prophecy, Policy and Propaganda," in R. Beaton and C. Roueché (eds), *The Making of Byzantine History: Studies Dedicated to Donald M. Nicol* (Aldershot: Variorum, 1993), 3–34, L. DiTommaso, "History and Apocalyptic Eschatology: A Reply to J. Y. Jindo," *Vetus Testamentum* 56 (2006), 413–18, and M. E. Stone, *Ancient Judaism: New Visions and Views* (Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2011), 59–89.

13. Daniel 1, composed in Hebrew though possibly translated from an Aramaic

presented in the form of King Nebuchadnezzar's dream of a great statue composed of four metals of descending value, terminates with an allusion to dynastic intermarriages between the Ptolemies and Seleucids, denoting that it was composed no later than the first decade of the second century BCE. Significantly, the review does not refer to the hated Antiochus IV, who assumed the Seleucid throne in the year 175, or to the events of the Maccabean Revolt of 167–164 that his actions towards the Jerusalem temple and its High Priesthood provoked. Rather, the dream and its interpretation by Daniel, an exile at the court of the Babylonian king, are a Jewish reiteration of a tradition, widespread in antiquity, about the sequential transfer of world power (*translatio imperii*) through four states or rulers.[14] The schema of four world-empires was reused in Daniel 7, composed slightly before Antiochus's desecration of the temple. The author of Daniel 7 substituted the four metals of the statue of Daniel 2 with four beasts crawling out of the chaos sea, replaced its third-person dream with a first-person dream-vision, and exchanged its Deuteronomic theology of history with an apocalyptic one. The fact that scores of generations of readers of the book of Daniel have understood the historical review of Chapter 2 in light of Chapter 7—in other words, apocalyptically—is beyond dispute. But this is very different from asserting that Daniel 2 is an apocalypse or is apocalyptic. All of this underscores the earlier point about the need to maintain clarity regarding terminology and definitions.

I am likewise not convinced that Sirach 51 can be classified under the apocalyptic "genre." As I see it, nothing in this chapter or in 50:24, which Oegema discusses specifically, reflects any of the propositions of the apocalyptic worldview. In fact, Collins makes a strong case that Sirach 34:1-8 is an unequivocal *rejection* of apocalypticism.[15] In the final analysis, Sirach seem to be a textbook illustration of wisdom literature (in its broad sense), and scholarship seems rather one-sided in its agreement on this point.

My perspective on apocalyptic literature further diverges from Oegema's in terms of his assessment about the essential difference between it and prophecy:

> Prophetic literature sees the human heart as the origin of evil, salvation as something coming from God, when men repent, and the time of redemption tied to the Day of the Lord, but very much being part of this world, whereas apocalyptic literature clearly states that the fallen angels brought evil into the world, that salvation is something that comes from outside, and that the time of redemption is at the calculated end of this world and the beginning of the world to come. In other words, we are dealing with quite different concepts of anthropology, theology, and view of world history.

original, was probably written to function as an editorial prefix which contextualised the stories of Chapters 2–6, but now functions as the introduction to the entire book.

14. In later iterations, the schema was infrequently expanded to include a fifth kingdom..

15. J. J. Collins, "Wisdom, Apocalypticism, and Generic Compatibility," reprinted in *Seers, Sibyls, and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism* (JSJSup 54; Leiden: Brill), 385–404.

I agree with the distinction Oegema draws between the prophetic Day of the Lord and the apocalyptic end of this world. I concur also with his insight that this distinction is an expression of a more profound set of differences between prophetic and apocalyptic views of history and theologies—and theologies of history—though it is not clear what anthropology means in this context. But the question of the origin of evil is not relevant to the issue of definition. It defines neither prophecy (where is it in Hosea?) nor apocalypticism (where is it in Daniel 7–12?), and for this reason cannot distinguish between them. The root of the misunderstanding is methodological. As noted, at one time Daniel was considered the first apocalypse, with the result that its features were assumed to be hallmarks of apocalyptic literature on the whole. Now the earliest Enochic literature has assumed the mantle, and the tendency is to define apocalyptic literature by virtue of *its* features, among which is a deep concern with the origin of evil in the world. This line of thought has become so commonplace in the scholarship that it almost gets taken for granted. But it is an equally spurious approach to understanding apocalypticism as a historical worldview.

I would also hesitate to identify salvation in the prophetic literature as something "coming from God," over and against salvation in apocalyptic literature as something that "comes from the outside." However "outside" is meant, it is essentially accurate. In the apocalyptic worldview, salvation is conceived of as being brought about by means of a reality that is transcendent to our own. It is always articulated as salvation out of this world.[16] But in the ancient apocalyptic literature, the transcendent reality is also always God.[17]

3. Conclusion

Oegema's paper concludes with nine points synthesized from the data presented in its previous sections. I am in agreement with his point that the Maccabean Revolt was "intellectually prepared by a preceding common (and/or suddenly acute?) apocalyptic worldview," though I have reservations about his conception of apocalypses and apocalyptic literature, as outlined above. However, the ways in which the Revolt was "intellectually prepared" by the apocalyptic worldview are not spelled out in much detail. Perhaps not enough evidence remains to do so. Yet it is strange that Oegema does not bring the revelatory visions of Daniel 8, 9, and 10–12 within the orbit of his investigation. Their historical reviews speak as much to the events of the Maccabean Revolt as does the review in Daniel 7. The revelation of Chapters 10–12 in particular contains a wealth of data about these

16. Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 221.

17. This is not true in the modern expressions of the worldview, and an important taxonomical distinction can be made on this very point. Biblical apocalypticism equates the transcendent reality with God or his otherworldly abode (Heaven). Secular apocalypticism equates it with a divinised humanity, superhuman agencies, a force of nature or history, or anything else that does not require a supernatural explanation.

tumultuous years, as well as a genuine prediction about the fate of Antiochus IV (11:40–45). Significantly, the four visions of Daniel 7–12 were composed as distinct units, one after the other, and not by the same author. My point is that these four visions not only preserve a record of the Maccabean Revolt which is precisely contemporary with its events (unlike, for example, 1 Maccabees), but also represent a window into the development of the apocalyptic worldview in correspondence with these events, and presumably because of them. The lines of influence are palpable in the shift in language from Aramaic to Hebrew, the movement from dream-visions to true visions, and the inclusion of the expectation for a post-mortem resurrection and judgment of individuals at the climax of the final revelation.

Finally, I am in full accord with Oegema's central conviction that there is one apocalyptic worldview. During the *table ronde* that concluded the Nangeroni Seminar, the notion of multiple apocalypticisms was proposed in order to account for the variety of motifs and concerns among the early Jewish apocalypses. I do not see this as a step forward. If apocalypticism is to be distinguished from prophecy and other revelatory phenomena, a certain taxonomical identity and historical coherence must be presumed. This does not deny that there are different *types* of apocalypticism (historical and otherworldly, like Daniel and the earliest Enochic literature), or that it is expressed in different *modes* (biblical and secular). The *form* of the worldview in one historical period or culture can also be quite distinctive when compared to forms in other periods or cultures. Consider mediaeval apocalypticism, which is the form of the worldview common to Christianity, Judaism, and Islam during the thousand years between the end of the Roman Empire in the West and the end of the Byzantine Empire in the East. Similarities in the structure and content of the apocalyptic literature across these centuries demonstrate the form, as does a shared set of eschatological motifs that either originated or developed their typical features after the fourth century CE. These features distinguish mediaeval apocalypticism from the ancient, modern, and contemporary forms of the worldview. However, the axioms that underwrite it are identical to those that underwrite these other forms. They propose a comprehensive, comprehensible, and internally consistent view of time, space, and human existence. These in turn describe an *apocalyptic minimum* which distinguishes the apocalyptic worldview from other phenomena, and by which cultural expressions and social movements over time may be identified as apocalyptic.[18]

18. On the "apocalyptic minimum" and the propositions of the worldview, see L. DiTommaso, *The Architecture of Apocalypticism* (forthcoming: Oxford University Press).

Response to Oegema

John Kampen

It is an honor to respond to this comprehensive, insightful paper by Professor Oegema, who in it forces us to deal with a very basic question: How are we to understand the Maccabean Revolt in light of the literature it generated both by way of description or allusion? In so doing, he invites us to reexamination the revolt from the standpoint of apocalypticism and evaluate the methods we employ in the study of this phenomenon and its related literature. My brief remarks on this paper will identify five issues that I think warrant further examination and discussion.

1.

The extent to which, in describing a variety of approaches to the study of apocalypticism, Oegema's study focuses on its relationship to Hebrew prophecy is significant. This focus reflects the influence of Paul Hanson and others who understand the major task in the study of the development of apocalypticism (or "apocalyptic"—the noun [Grabbe 2003: 3]) and apocalyptic literature to be the identification of the manner in which it became differentiated from prophetic movements and their literature. More recently, Lester Grabbe even has questioned the distinction between the historical emphasis of the prophetic materials and a more mythological approach ascribed to apocalypticism, incorporating mantic literature into the consideration as well and arguing that it is all prophetic (Grabbe 2003: 106–33). However this focus on prophetic literature can be problematic. In so doing it seems that Oegema, despite outlining multiple methodological approaches, has limited the potential of the apocalyptic literature to inform our understanding of apocalypticism, assuming there is a connection between them.

The wisdom literature of the Qumran corpus that became more widely available after 1991 has necessitated a reexamination of our assumptions about the nature of wisdom literature during the latter half of the Second Temple period as well as apocalyptic literature and related compositions with wisdom themes. The complex nature of early apocalyptic literature already was highlighted by Michael Stone in his groundbreaking study, "Lists of Revealed Things" (1976; see also 1980). Martha Himmelfarb in her studies of the ascent and descent literature in early Judaism highlights those themes in apocalyptic literature as well (1985; 1993). An emphasis on the revelatory aspect as the major characteristic of apocalyptic literature can be found in the work of Christopher Rowland (1982). If the distinguishing feature of apocalyptic literature is not its eschatological or temporal orientation, but rather "revelation … disclosing a transcendant reality," based on the 1979 SBL working group definition, then perhaps our approach to the study of apocalypticism is equally limiting (Collins 1998: 5). It is not helpful to beg the

question by proposing either the prophetic materials of the Hebrew Bible or the wisdom materials, as proposed by Van Rad, as the two choices for the literary traditions within which apocalyptic literature finds its origins. We can even add the Babylonian or Persian-Zoroastrian alternatives to that list and still miss an understanding of the phenomenon. What needs to be captured in the attempt to define apocalyptic literature is the particular twist that the biblical literature took during the Hellenistic era, and perhaps even late Persian following Michael Stone, that resulted in this revelatory literature that reflected diverse elements from the Hebrew Scriptures, while charting its own distinctive course(s).

An attempt to define, or at least describe, this later literary phenomenon is summarized in the volume *Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalypticism*, the work of a later ten-year SBL working group, which reached the following conclusion: "Wisdom and apocalypticism *are indeed* related both in many of their literary aspects and in their social contexts" (Wright et al. 2005: 3). This revealed knowledge that provides a very different perspective on reality is at the heart of apocalyptic literature and this aspect must be addressed and utilized when pursuing questions regarding the function of apocalyptic literature or the impact of apocalypticism. Noteworthy is the attention in this volume and associated studies both to the literary genre and the social context, similar to the issue of the relationship of the genre of apocalyptic literature and apocalypticism, as the term is used in Oegema's paper to designate an ideology that shapes or influences social movements, in this case in the late Second Temple period.

2.

It is difficult to argue, as proposed, that " there is clearly also a hasidaeic/essenic connection, or if we may believe certain passages, even a hasidaeic origin" (1.7; 3). Philip Davies (1977), John Collins (1993: 67–9), and I (1988: 45–150) all have demonstrated that there is no evidence for a connection between the poorly attested Hasideans of 1 Maccabees 2:42, 7:13, and 2 Maccabees 14:6 and an apocalyptic group, an essene group, or sectarian associations associated with the Dead Sea Scrolls. While I have proposed that the Greek transliteration of the Hebrew term indicates that the authors understood it to be a proper noun rather than simply a common adjective designating the "pious," this does not provide evidence of any connection with an "apocalyptic movement," hence is not of particular significance when addressing the question of whether the Maccabean Revolt was an apocalyptic movement. This means that the broad movement of the Hasidim advanced by Otto Plöger (1968) and Martin Hengel (1974) is not a valid starting-point for analysis. To argue that it "does reflect very clear opinions about the law and ethics" as evidence for this identification is not helpful, since that criterion could include many of the ideological options available to Jews in the second century BCE. There is no convincing argument that has yet been advanced for identifying specific bodies referred to in the books of 1 and 2 Maccabees with a specific movement described in or attached to apocalyptic literature. This means

that anchoring his investigation of the evidence in apocalyptic literature on the basis of this connection is an inadequate foundation from which to proceed.

3.

The paper assumes a similarity between the evidence of 1 and 2 Maccabees regarding the nature of the Maccabean Revolt and does not make the distinction warranted by the particular nature of the two compositions. While the paper does acknowledge the particular literary nature of each of the two works, it seems to gloss over those differences when it attempts to get behind those works to determine the nature of the Maccabean Revolt. 1 Maccabees is much more similar in form to the historical books of the Hebrew Bible such as Samuel and Kings than 2 Maccabees. Of course, the documentary materials betray the influence of the Greek historiographical tradition. 1 Maccabees serves to justify and legitimize the continuing Hasmonean claim to the high priesthood and presumably its dynastic rule.

The epitome known as 2 Maccabees is of a very different nature. It is not as apparent that it serves to legitimize the Hasmonean high priesthood or monarchy. It glorifies Judas alone, not the family lineage for the most part, and is interested in the sanctity of the temple. The mythological contest developed in the composition is between Judaism and Hellenism; however, that may be the lens through which we should read this particular composition rather than all of Jewish history of the second century BCE. Erich Gruen has suggested that historians have overinterpreted the conflict with Hellenism as the reigning interpretive principle for understanding the events of the Maccabean Revolt (1998: xiii–xx, 1–40), while Lee Levine suggested a need for greater nuance in the discussion (1999: 3–32). While the ideological center of the story rests with the conflict between Judaism and Hellenism, the fate of the temple is described as what was at stake. In an article on "The Books of the Maccabees and Sectarianism in Second Temple Judaism," I have demonstrated that violations of the temple as well as the protection of it and its sanctity are the pivotal events of the epitome (Kampen 2007; note also Doran 1981; Ego 2007). To summarize: This emphasis is apparent first of all in the story of Heliodorus as well as the piety of Onias III who kept the temple and its environs so free of wickedness that "the kings themselves honored the place and glorified the temple" (2 Macc. 3:1-3). With the entry of Judas Maccabeus into the work in a substantive manner in Chapter 8 we find the end of the second threat to the temple, the action of Antiochus when he entered "the most holy temple in the world" and carried off the holy vessels as well as eighteen hundred talents of gold (2 Macc. 5:15-26). 2 Maccabees 10:1-8 records the purification of the temple by Maccabeus and those around him, followed by the interesting conclusion in v. 9: "Such then was the end of Antiochus, who was called Epiphanes." For the epitomist the death of Antiochus is connected with the purification of the temple. The entire story of Judah Maccabee is framed in the context of the deliverance of the temple, beginning with its introduction in 2:19: "The story of Judas Maccabeus and his brothers, and the purification of the great temple and the dedication of the altar,"

and ending with the final encounter with Nicanor where Judas and his men found motivation for the battle "because the city and the santuary and the temple were in danger." While they were concerned about their wives and children, "their greatest and first fear was for the consecrated sanctuary" (2 Macc. 15:17-18). Heavenly forces appear in the defense of the temple in this climactic and final battle, just as they had in that initial encounter with Heliodorus. Justification for this interpretation can be found in the two epistles attached to the beginning of the epitome enjoining the celebration of the rededication of the temple, later known as Hanukkah. It has been suggested that the second letter was composed to highlight this feature as the purpose of the epitome (Momigliano 1975). Judas is the heroic figure favored by the divine to save the temple; the Hasmoneans are not endorsed as monarchs or high priests. By miracle and heroism, the temple is preserved as the cultural and religious center of Jewish life, opposed to those Hellenizing forces both internal and external that would rival it for ultimate control.

The failure to examine these literary compositions that are our primary sources for information about the Maccabean Revolt limits the ability of the inquirer to answer the major question of the paper: "Was the Maccabean Revolt an apocalyptic movement?" Are the images of the "tragic" or "pathetic" historiography of 2 Maccabeees at all informed by apocalyptic literature? What about the descriptions of martyrdom and the allusions to resurrection? Are there connections between either of these compositions and the book of Daniel? Further investigation of the literary connections would appear to be necessary in order to probe the nature of our primary sources in the investigation of this phenomenon.

4.

Further investigation of the apocalyptic literature cited in the paper also seems desirable. Certain references in apocalyptic literature to Judah Maccabee may take on a different hue. It is not clear that the endorsement of Judah Maccabee in 1 Enoch 90:9-13 translates into some positive view of the Hasmoneans. It speaks to the raised expectations that either supported or resulted from the revolt, but does not indicate a pro-Hasmonean outlook. While Oegema makes reference to the problems of the composition history, he does not note that many commentators understand those verses that refer to Judah Maccabee as a doublet or an interpolation into an older text (Tiller 1993: 69–79; Nickelsburg 2001: 396–8). Since the new temple appears after the judgement, the author probably did not have the rededicated Hasmonean temple in mind. In the apocalyptic chronology I would rather propose that it is at the point of the judgement scene that the author moves into the revealed projections for the future, rather than any sense of a realized eschatology. In the *Apocalypse of Weeks*, the Second Temple appears to be omitted, with "the temple of the kingdom of the Great One … built in the greatness of its glory for all the generations for eternity" first making an appearance in the eighth week (1 Enoch 91:13). Just prior to the judgement in the *Animal Apocalypse*, a large sword is given to the sheep to strike down the beasts, the sheep go out

to kill them, and all the beasts and birds of heaven flee before them (1 Enoch 90:19). Similarly in the *Apocalypse of Weeks*, a sword is given into the hand of all the righteous in the eighth week to execute righteous judgement on all the wicked prior to the construction of the temple (1 Enoch 91:12). The anticipated eschatological temple is the more likely candidate for the hope expressed in the *Animal Apocalypse* as well. Since there is room for all Israel in it, it could also be speaking of the New Jerusalem (Nickelsburg 2001: 404–5). The interpolation of the material related to Judah Maccabee into this apocalyptic scenario could be an attempt to provide evidence of the willingness of God to intervene in human history on behalf of Israel rather than of the Maccabean Revolt as an apocalyptic event; in other words, the references to Judah may be no more than those to David and Solomon (1 Enoch 89:42-50). There is no reason to connect the future temple in the these two apocalypses of Enoch with the rededicated temple of the Maccabees.

It also is not clear to me that the end of the *Third Sybilline Oracle* constitutes a case of realized eschatology, as it is proposed in this paper. The promises of Isaiah are certainly relevant for an understanding of this text, but it is less clear that the full promise is being realized in the author's own day. That would appear to be the hope of the author as expressed in the text, but it is a much more difficult case to argue that the hope is fully realized in a significant manner. In many ways it might be more accurate, in the context of what we understand about apocalyptic literature, to argue that the author hopes the promises are being realized at the time of writing. The statements here stand in marked contrast to the realized eschatology of a Pesher Habakkuk or certain New Testament writings. In any case, it also is not clear how the argument for a realized eschatology in this Alexandrian composition provides evidence for seeing the Maccabean Revolt as an apocalyptic movement.

Clearly the book of Daniel reflects the time of the build-up to the Maccabean Revolt and its earliest stages, probably in the same sense as Enoch in the manner described above. It suggests a time of great expectation with a focus on the temple. However we do note that as the developments of the era are described in greater detail in the latter chapters of the composition, the Maccabean Revolt does not seem to be perceived as of particular significance. While it is debated, I consider most probably that the "little help" that the *maskilim* receive in Daniel 11:34 are the heroes of the Maccabean Revolt. Not the Hasmoneans, it is the *maskilim* who shall shine like the brightness of the sky in Daniel 12:3, the apparent group in which this composition finds its origins. In this case there is actually a projection of the end of the abomination of the temple without mention of a rededication. The direct intervention of God would appear to make a rededicated temple unnecessary, the end is here. Only the *maskilim* have a true understanding of the sequence of human history and its end.

I am inclined to agree for the most part in the reading of the *Assumption of Moses* found in this paper. It is rooted in the response to the decrees and actions of Antiochus Epiphanes. However when Taxo and his seven sons fast for three days and then go into a cave, preferring to die rather than transgress the

commandments of the Lord of Lords (*T. Mos.* 9:6), this act of martyrdom stands in marked contrast to the mobilization of the masses ascribed to Mattathias and his friends after the devout die as a result of not fighting on the Sabbath (1 Macc. 2:29-38). So while that story is anchored in the time of the Maccabean Revolt, the actual Maccabean options, with the exception of the martyrdom in 2 Macc 7, are rejected.

2 Maccabees may be evidence of a tradition that highlighted the heroism of Judah and an ideology that considered the temple the center of the life of the Judeans, however this does not directly translate into support for the Hasmonean dynasty nor of the Second Temple over which they presided.

5.

George Nickelsburg has demonstrated that the Mosaic law is not the fundamental reference point for Jewish behavior in the books of Enoch (1998). While we find evidence in 1 and 2 Maccabees about the centrality of the law to their ethics and their identity, this is not the appeal we find in the books of 1 Enoch. While there is clear evidence that ethical concerns are at the center of 1 Enoch, developed most markedly in the Epistle, a feature shared with 1 and 2 Maccabees, it is not apparent that they share the same orientation to the question. A similar argument could be made for certain wisdom compositions from the Qumran corpus such as Instruction and Mysteries. In other words, ethics can be seen to be a primary concern in apocalyptic literature, and by extension, of apocalypticism, however this may not only or always be centered in law, or Torah. A more nuanced discussion reflecting a greater diversity of options may be necessary to penetrate the ethical presuppositions basic to this literature. It seems to me that there are competing trajectories running through Second Temple Judaism and the identification of them is necessary in order to answer the question of this paper. The use of Torah in 1 Maccabees in particular may be closer to the manner in which it is employed in Ben Sira 24 than to the ethics developed in many of the apocalyptic texts of the second century BCE.

Bibliography

Collins, John J. (1993), *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress).

Collins, John J. (1998), *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*, 2nd edn (Semeia 14; Missoula: Scholars Press).

Davies, Philip R. (1977) "Hasidim in the Maccabean Period," *JJS*, 28: 127–40.

Doran, Robert (1981), *Temple Propaganda: The Purpose and Character of 2 Maccabees* (CBQMS 12; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association).

Ego, Beate (2007), "God's Justice. The 'Measure for Measure' Principle in 2 Maccabees," in Géza Xeravits and Józseph Zsengellér (eds), *The Books of the Maccabees:*

History, Theology, Ideology, Papers of the Second International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Pápa, Hungary, 9-11 June, 2006 (Leiden: Brill), 141–54.
Gruen, Erich S. (1998), *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition* (Berkeley: University of California Press).
Hengel, Martin (1974), *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*, 2 vols, trans. John Bowden (Philadelphia: Fortress).
Himmelfarb, Martha (1985), *Tours of Hell: An Apocalyptic Form in Jewish and Christian Literature* (Philadelphia: Fortress).
Himmelfarb, Martha (1993), *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (New York: Oxford University Press).
Kampen, John (1988), *The Hasideans and the Origin of Pharisaism: A Study in 1 and 2 Maccabees* (SCS 24; Atlanta: Scholars Press).
Kampen, John (2007), "The Books of the Maccabees and Sectarianism in Second Temple Judaism," in Géza Xeravits and József Zsengellér (eds), *The Books of the Maccabees: History, Theology, Ideology, Papers of the Second International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Pápa, Hungary, 9-11 June, 2006* (Leiden: Brill), 11–30.
Levine, Lee I. (1999), *Judaism and Hellenism in Antiquity: Conflict or Confluence?* (Peabody: Henrickson).
Momigliano, Arnaldo (1975), "The Second Book of Maccabees," *CP*, 70: 81–8.
Nickelsburg, George W. E. (1998), "Enochic Wisdom: An Alternative to the Mosaic Torah," in Jodi Magness et al. (eds), *Hesed ve-Emet: Studies in Honor of Ernest S. Frerichs* (Atlanta: Scholars Press), 123–32.
Nickelsburg, George W. E. (2001), *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress).
Rowland, Christopher (1982), *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (New York: Crossroad).
Plöger, Otto (1968), *Theocracy and Eschatololgy*, trans. S. Rudman (Richmond: John Knox).
Stone, Michael (1976), "Lists of Revealed Things in Apocalyptic Literature," in Frank Moore Cross, W. E. Lemke, and Patrick D. Miller, Jr. (eds), *Magnali Dei: The Mighty Acts of God* (Garden City: Doubleday), 414–52.
Stone, Michael (1980), *Scriptures, Sects and Visions: A Profile of Judaism from Ezra to the Jewish Revolts* (Philadelphia: Fortress).
Tiller, Patrick A. (1993), *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of* I Enoch (SBLEJL 4; Atlanta: Scholars Press).
Wright, Benjamin G., III and Lawrence M. Wills (eds) (2005), *Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalypticism* (Symposium 35; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature).

3

Apocalyptic Worldviews—What They Are and How They Spread: Insights From The Social Sciences

Anathea E. Portier-Young

The call for papers for the conference that occasioned this volume invited participants to ask "how pervasive was the apocalyptic worldview" in the Seleucid and Hasmonean periods, and to explore relationships "between apocalyptic and society" and the ways "different social groups and strata engage[d] with apocalyptic thought and literature." This paper focuses on what is meant by "worldview" in this context. In our scholarly literature we have often talked about something we call an apocalyptic worldview. We reconstruct this worldview from texts we call apocalypses, and we infer that the worldview is spread by means of these and other apocalyptic texts. In this essay I do not argue for or against the existence of apocalyptic worldview(s), nor do I define a specifically *apocalyptic* worldview. Rather, I examine the meaning and function of "worldview" as understood in sociological and related literature and consider ways that worldviews may spread. To the extent that we continue to speak of apocalyptic worldview(s), it is hoped that my contribution will promote greater precision in their characterization and offer a clearer picture of how widespread an apocalyptic worldview, or worldviews, may have been in early Judaism.

In Part 1, I enquire into the use of the phrase "apocalyptic worldview" by modern scholars who study ancient Judaism. In Part 2, I focus on the second part of the phrase, surveying scholarship from a range of fields, including philosophy, sociology, and psychology, concerning the meaning, nature, and function of "worldview." In Part 3 I propose implications of this survey for how we might think about "apocalyptic worldview(s)". In Part 4, I highlight new perspectives on the Qumran scrolls and aspects of early Jewish novelistic literature that inform our understanding of the spread of apocalyptic worldviews in the Hellenistic period. Part 5 surveys social-scientific scholarship on the spread of norms, ideas, and ideologies to determine ways by which a worldview or its components might spread and suggest conditions that might have facilitated or impeded the spread of an apocalyptic worldview in the Hellenistic period.

I propose that the conditions of empire in the Hellenistic period facilitated the genesis and spread of an apocalyptic worldview. In Judea, the formation of

the Hasmonean state c. 141 BCE precipitated further revisions in the worldview of various social groups and strata. Judea's ruling classes in this period may have been inoculated against and in some measure opposed to an apocalyptic worldview. Sociological and epidemiological models and insights will be helpful for thinking about how an apocalyptic worldview nonetheless continued to spread not only in Judea but also in Galilee and Diasporic Jewish communities.[1]

1. Apocalyptic worldview, apocalypticism, apocalypses

In modern scholarship on things apocalyptic, there is sometimes a tendency to conflate the terms apocalypticism and apocalyptic worldview. That is, apocalypticism appears to have two meanings in current scholarly usage, one of which refers to a socio-religious movement, the other of which refers to a way of looking at the world and understanding one's place in it.

In his influential book *Dawn of Apocalyptic* Paul Hanson offered a set of terminological clarifications to distinguish between apocalypse, apocalyptic eschatology, and apocalypticism. The last firstly denotes for Hanson a socio-religious movement born from the experience of alienation and the failure of specific hopes in relation to particular historical events.

Within such a movement a new "symbolic universe," or "system of concepts and symbols," provides a frame and script for identity and a means for interpreting an otherwise confusing reality.[2] Hanson recognizes that there is not one symbolic universe to be associated with ancient Jewish apocalyptic movements, but several. Any movement's symbolic universe will be conditioned by the movement's traditions, its sociohistorical and political context, its contact with other cultures, and its interaction with proponents and effects of competing conceptual systems. Amid this diversity, Hanson identifies apocalyptic eschatology as a defining feature of the symbolic universes of ancient Jewish apocalyptic movements.[3] In Hanson's usage, apocalypticism refers both to an apocalyptic socio-religious movement and to a symbolic universe, or what is now frequently called worldview, proper to such a movement. Obviously, they are not the same thing.

This terminological ambiguity, not unique to Hanson, results from and perpetuates a conceptual coupling and blurring whereby apocalyptic movement and worldview continually evoke, assume, and stand for one another. It will be helpful to ask whether movement and worldview can or should be uncoupled from one another and, if so, what are the implications for our answer to the question "how pervasive was [the] apocalyptic worldview?"

1. On Galilee, see George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee," *JBL* 100/4 (1981): 575–600.

2. Paul Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic: The Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1975), 432.

3. Hanson, *Dawn of Apocalyptic*, 433.

John J. Collins follows Paul Hanson in using the term apocalypticism to refer to historical, social, and religious movements as well as the "symbolic universe[s]" or "ideolog[ies]" (the latter is Collins's term) of such movements.[4] Collins also explicitly refers to this symbolic universe as an "apocalyptic worldview," the characteristics of which he summarizes in three points:

> the world is mysterious and revelation must be transmitted from a supernatural source, through the mediation of angels; there is a hidden world of angels and demons that is directly relevant to human destiny; and this destiny is finally determined by a definitive eschatological judgment.[5]

Collins derives these characteristics of an apocalyptic worldview from his analysis of the ancient apocalypses. Yet Collins also allows that an apocalyptic worldview can be found in ancient Jewish texts that are not apocalypses (e.g., *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness*, typically dated between 160 BCE and 1 C BCE).[6] For Collins, what distinguishes apocalypticism, both as movement and as worldview, from nonapocalyptic social and religious movements and their ideologies or symbol systems is that apocalypticism "shares the conceptual structure of the apocalypses."[7]

This formulation is helpful, but it raises for me a second question about method and assumptions. We work from apocalypses to apocalypticism and apocalyptic worldview because the apocalypses are the data that led us to posit apocalypticism and apocalyptic worldview in the first place. Apocalypses also remain the evidence for apocalypticism and apocalyptic worldview most readily available to us.[8] But is it proper to give conceptual priority to apocalypses in explaining or describing an apocalyptic worldview? We work with the evidence we have. But does this pragmatic necessity potentially lead to a conceptual confusion, in particular an overidentification of apocalyptic worldview with apocalypses?

4. John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: an Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*, 2nd edn (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans), 1998, 13.

5. Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 8.

6. Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 9. Collins develops this point in greater depth in *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Routledge, 1997).

7. Apocalypticism is not monolithic, however, but characterizes different movements in different times and places. John J. Collins, "From Prophecy to Apocalypticism: The Expectation of the End," in John J. Collins (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism, vol. 1, The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity* (London: Continuum, 2000), 129–61, 157–8.

8. In all, the evidence we have for Jewish apocalyptic worldviews in the Seleucid and Hasmonean periods appears to consist of: 1) texts we identify as apocalypses; 2) texts we identify as having apocalyptic elements; 3) beliefs, practices, and assumptions about the world inferred from the documentary finds associated with the settlement at Qumran; and 4) indirect historiographic evidence from the writings of Philo and Josephus, particularly their accounts of the Essenes but also possibly Josephus's descriptions of the Pharisees.

2. Worldview(s)

It is certain that texts participate in the construction (and maintenance, and demolition) of worldviews, symbol systems, and conceptual structures, for writers and audiences alike. Texts also presuppose and interact with existing worldviews, symbol systems, and conceptual structures. They may represent one or more worldviews accurately or falsely, and will always convey only a part of what they assume, modify, or oppose. Thus texts and worldviews are not likely to bear simple one-to-one correspondences.

Moreover, worldviews are contained or transmitted not only by texts, but through social interactions and practices such as ritual, song, and prayer.[9] Worldviews are also transmitted through language and institutions, education in all its forms, architecture and iconography, postures and hierarchies, modes of dress, and economic choices.[10]

For philosophers Leo Apostel and Jan Van der Veken, worldview (*wereldbeeld*) entails ontology, explanation (or etiology), prediction, axiology, praxeology, and epistemology. That is, worldview answers questions about what is, about past and future, about values, morality, and aesthetics, about actions, and about knowledge.[11] As such it includes values and norms.[12] Cultural anthropologist Michael Kearney offers what may be seen as a complementary understanding of worldview.[13] For Kearney, worldview entails "assumptions and images" about "self and other, relationship, classification, causality, space, and time." Kearney, like Hanson, insists that worldview must be analyzed in relation to, and not in isolation from, wider "economic, political, and demographic relationships."[14]

Everyone has, or operates within, a worldview—we cannot interact with the world without one.[15] But a worldview is not invented by an individual. Charles

9. Clifford Geertz argues that for most people ritual is the primary means of transmitting a religious worldview (*Islam Observed: Religious Development in Morocco and Indonesia* [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971], 100). Ritual's efficacy in transmitting a worldview owes in part to the ways in which it draws individuals and communities into shared, embodied, and public interaction with the religious symbol-system.

10. On worldview and language, see Lera Boroditsky, "Linguistic Relativity," in Lynn Nadel (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Cognitive Science* (London: Macmillan, 2003), 917–22.

11. Clément Vidal, "Wat is een wereldbeeld? (What is a worldview?)" in H. Van Belle and J. Van der Veken (eds), *Nieuwheid denken. De wetenschappen en het creatieve aspect van de werkelijkheid* (Leuven: Acco, 2008), 4.

12. Diderik Batens and Wim Christiaens, "Leo Apostel's World Views Program in the Perspective of his Causal Ontology: A Critical Appraisal," in Diederik Aerts, Hubert Van Belle, and Jan Van der Veken (eds), *Worldviews and the Problem of Synthesis* (Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1999), 52. For Batens and Christiaens, worldview functions primarily to "direct experience, understanding, and actions" (63).

13. Michel Kearney, *World View* (Novato, CA: Chandler and Sharp, 1984).

14. Kearney, *World View*, 7.

15. Vidal, "What is a worldview," 7.

Kraft, among others, locates a worldview within a given culture or subculture, where it organizes the (sub)culture's conceptual system and guides its application.[16]

Peter Berger's concept of nomos and the *Weltanschauung* that legitimates it offers a similarly social understanding of what I have been calling worldview while also calling attention to how it functions not only for a group but also for individuals.[17] Nomos, for Berger, is a "socially established" means of ordering experience to provide shared meaning within a group. It both comprehends and transcends the individual's experiences, providing a meaningful location in the world and a "shield against terror." Yet nomos is partial and mutable. Berger traces a society's "nomizing" activity through language to the building and valuing of knowledge. Through socialization individuals appropriate both the knowledge and the nomos it conveys. This process of socialization does not occur once and for all but is continual. Individuals and even groups "forget," especially, Berger argues, in times of crisis, such as confrontation with death or a change in the status of one's group.[18] Such situations can elicit a sense that one's previous definition of reality, or that of a group to which one belongs, is fragile or false. These situations "reveal the innate precariousness of all social worlds." At such times an individual may experience a frightening "anomy" or worldlessness, isolation from society and with it the loss of one's identity and bearings in reality. Individuals will go to great lengths to protect, recover, or acquire a nomos that can make sense of the apparent data of reality. At the same time, societies develop a host of legitimating "procedures" to reinforce nomos, including formulas, institutions, and pedagogies.[19]

Berger's analysis highlights not only the interplay between individual and society in the genesis, maintenance, and function of worldview, but also what Eugene Webb calls its fluidity.[20] Building on the influential work of philosopher Karl Jaspers, Webb notes that worldview creates a fluid space between a fluid subject and object.[21] This is the space of world-understanding, self-understanding, and decision-making.[22] It is constantly changing, developing, responding to the dissonance and questions created by limit experiences (Jaspers's *Grenzsituationen*

16. Charles Kraft, *Christianity in Culture: A Study in Biblical Theologizing in Cross Cultural Perspective* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1980), 53.

17. Peter Berger, *The Sacred Canopy: Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1967).

18. Cf. Karl Jaspers's notion of *Grenzsituationen* developed in *Psychologie der Weltanschauungen* (Berlin: Verlag von Julius Springer, 1919), 202–47.

19. Berger, *Sacred Canopy*. Among these legitimations, James Sire emphasizes the importance of both presuppositions and stories. James Sire, *Naming the Elephant: Worldview as a Concept* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2004), 122.

20. Eugene Webb, *Worldview and Mind: Religious Thought and Psychological Development* (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri, 2009), 17.

21. Jaspers, *Psychologie der Weltanschauungen*.

22. Webb, *Worldview and Mind*, 12.

correspond to the crisis situations noted by Berger and discussed above).[23] For the Jewish communities of the Seleucid and Hasmonean periods we might include among these crisis situations (or limit experiences) displacement, war, terror, military occupation, encounter with death, and other types of personal and social struggle, as well as seemingly positive changes such as state formation and the end of foreign military occupation.

Finally, while many emphasize unconscious and pretheoretical aspects of worldview, others have called attention to the combination of unconscious and conscious processes in worldview formation, maintenance, and revision. Developmental psychologist Jean Piaget called attention to the "sociogenesis" of knowledge from childhood through adulthood by means of constantly developing, dialectical processes of "differentiation, integration, and synthesis of new structures out of the old."[24] In adolescence and adulthood this process can become increasingly reflective and intentional, and can be facilitated or impeded by conscious choices.[25]

The preceding discussion has drawn on the work of thinkers from several fields: philosophy, sociology, cultural anthropology, theology, linguistics, and psychology. I pause here to reiterate the salient points and suggest how they might inform our study of apocalyptic worldview in the Seleucid and Hasmonean periods.

1. *People or texts?* A worldview may be proper to a social group or an individual. An individual's worldview is socially acquired and has an existence both within and apart from the group's worldview. Worldviews are not proper to texts, nor do texts and worldviews have a one-to-one correspondence. Worldviews do not develop in isolation, but develop through group interactions, nor can they be studied apart from the contexts in which they take shape.
2. *Content:* Worldviews entail ontology (including cosmology, anthropology, and, for our purposes, theology), etiology, prediction, axiology (values), praxeology, and epistemology. They entail assumptions about self, other, relationship, classification, causality, space, and time. They draw on existing traditions, concepts, and symbols.
3. *Function*: Worldviews provide meaning and guidance. Sharing a worldview with a group can yield security, social acceptance, a common bearing in reality, and a sense of shared identity.
4. *Transmission*: Worldviews are transmitted or communicated through a variety of means, including social interactions (conversation, rituals, meals,

23. Webb, *Worldview and Mind*, 15–16.

24. This helpful summary of Piaget's thought is taken from Gabriele Chiari and Maria Laura Nuzzo, *Constructivist Psychotherapy: A Narrative Hermeneutic Approach* (New York: Routledge, 2010), 79.

25. Webb, *Worldview and Mind,* 9–10.

etc.), language, education, written texts, architecture, iconography, and social hierarchies.

5. *Change*: Worldviews are constantly in flux and take conscious and unconscious effort to construct, maintain, and revise. Limit situations challenge existing worldviews and can lead to changes in worldview. Positive or seemingly positive experiences can also lead to changes in worldview. These changes have social ramifications. Challenges to worldview can be frightening.

3. Implications

What are some of the implications of these points for our study of apocalyptic worldview in the Hellenistic period?

Because worldview appears to be a property of both groups and individuals, it will be important to look beyond known social groups and pay attention to individuals and to interactions between individuals, across groups, and within wider and more diffuse social circles.

In addition, we must posit (and speak of) not one ancient Jewish apocalyptic worldview but many.

We must also posit a high level of continuity between ancient Jewish apocalyptic worldviews and the nonapocalyptic worldviews that precede and coexist with them, as they a) build on shared traditions, b) emerge within shared cultural settings, and c) are continually reshaped in processes of interaction across groups and across a variety of shared social networks and settings. These apocalyptic and nonapocalyptic worldviews will therefore share many features in common and may in various ways respond to one another. While these points of contact have been recognized before, distinctive features are more often emphasized than commonalities.[26] A more nuanced and balanced perspective may lead us to revise our picture of the social locations of groups who hold apocalyptic worldviews in the Seleucid and Judean periods.

Given that worldviews have many components and are constantly in flux, it is logical that scholars have failed to agree on one, two, or three defining features of an apocalyptic worldview. Some, like Hanson, have emphasized eschatology, others epistemology, others theodicy, and so on.[27] Some of the components of

26. See, however, Lester Grabbe, "Prophetic and Apocalyptic: Time for New Definitions—and New Thinking," in Lester Grabbe and Robert Haak (eds), *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic and their Relationships* (London: T&T Clark, 2003), 107–33.

27. A very helpful survey is found in Lorenzo DiTommaso's "Apocalypses and Apocalypticism in Antiquity (Part I)," *Currents in Biblical Research* 5 (2007): 235–86, esp. 242–7. Examples: Epistemology: Christopher Rowland, *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (New York: Crossroad, 1982); Theodicy: Paolo Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History* (Brescia: Paideia, 1990).

worldview named above have received more attention from scholars of apocalyptic than others. My sense is that a fuller, non-essentialist understanding of apocalyptic worldview will enhance our capacity to perceive, describe, and explain the extent of such worldviews and imagine the processes by which they spread in the Hellenistic period.

Ancient Jewish apocalyptic literature values textuality as a locus of authority and means of revelation, transmission, and preservation. But apocalyptic worldviews were transmitted and communicated not primarily through texts but rather through social interactions and practices. To reconstruct how apocalyptic worldviews may have spread, we must attend to those interactions and practices.

Previous scholarship on apocalypticism has identified alienation and/or crisis as catalysts for the formation of apocalyptic (or, in Stephen Cook's preferred terminology, millennial) movements and their worldviews.[28] In addition, worldview may change within a movement, just as worldviews will change outside of it. Jaspers's category of limit situation offers a somewhat wider and more flexible understanding of the many kinds of event that can lead to changes in worldview. Experiences of individuals, small groups, and large groups (including a city, nation, or region) can all prompt changes in worldview. These experiences may be negative or positive. A change in worldview may arise when a perception of new data does not make sense within the old worldview or when the cost of maintaining particular elements of the old worldview is judged to be unnecessarily high. We will thus want to look at micro- and macro-circumstances and events that can be considered limit situations and also attend to possible incentives and disincentives for maintaining, adopting, discarding, or changing a worldview.[29]

According to the understanding of worldview sketched above, it would seem that one cannot maintain an apocalyptic worldview as such apart from a group that shares it. Those groups have commonly been labeled apocalyptic movements, with a presumption that they are peripheral to the mainstream. In some cases this presumption appears to be validated by close analysis of the textual and other evidence at our disposal.[30] But is that true in all cases? Have our definitions of apocalyptic movements unnecessarily narrowed our field of vision? It has already been recognized that alienation and failed hopes are not necessary ingredients of apocalypticism. I am wondering whether we might detect the presence of

28. Stephen Cook, *Prophecy and Apocalypticism: The Postexilic Social Setting* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995), 47: "Events can call currently held worldviews into question creating cognitive dissonance – a situation ripe for millennialism." Cf. James VanderKam, *From Revelation to Canon* (Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 261.

29. Compare David Chalcraft's discussion of "Benefit of Membership and Social Consequences" in "Towards a Weberian Sociology of the Qumran Sects" in David Chalcraft (ed.), *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances* (London: Equinox, 2007), 74–105, 86–90.

30. See Eyal Regev, *Sectarianism in Qumran: A Cross-Cultural Perspective* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007) and the essays in Chalcraft, *Sectarianism in Early Judaism*.

apocalyptic worldviews closer to the mainstream of Judaism in the periods in question.[31]

4. Apocalyptic worldview beyond the apocalypses

In examining early Jewish apocalypses, Collins has identified two clusters of literature separated by over two centuries.[32] The first cluster includes the *Apocalypse of Weeks* and *Book of Dream Visions* (both preserved in 1 Enoch) and Hebrew-and-Aramaic Daniel. These apocalypses respond to events in Seleucid Judea roughly between the years 175 and 165 BCE, including Antiochus IV Epiphanes's campaign of state terror that entailed the reconquest and occupation of Jerusalem and the religious persecution of Judeans.[33] The second cluster of apocalypses, consisting of 4 Ezra, 2 Baruch, and 3 Baruch, postdates the first Jewish revolt against Rome, its failure, and the destruction of the Jerusalem temple by Roman troops in 70 CE.

The genre's apparent centuries-long hibernation suggests that the situations just named conduced to the writing of apocalypses. Even if the converse could be demonstrated, that the circumstances of the intervening years did not conduce to the writing of apocalypses, it would not follow that during these years apocalyptic worldviews went underground. Rather, evidence suggests that they continued to spread and develop.

Collins recognizes "considerable evidence [apart from the apocalypses] for the spread of apocalyptic ideas in several areas of Jewish life."[34] Evidence pertinent for our period adduced by Collins includes the Qumran scrolls, especially *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness*, possibly Josephus's description of the Pharisaic belief in resurrection, early portions of the *Testament of Moses*, and early portions of the Sibylline Oracles (unique in this list for their Egyptian provenance).[35] This list is not exhaustive.

31. Cf. the remarks of John J. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Routledge, 1997), 6: "It is true that some aspects of the apocalyptic worldview, such as the belief in demonic powers, were widely shared in the Hellenistic age, and that others, such as judgment after death, eventually came to be widely shared in Judaism. In the last two centuries [before] the common era, however, apocalypticism constituted a distinctive worldview within Judaism, as can be seen by contrasting the Book of Enoch with Ben Sira or Daniel with 1 Maccabees. It is impossible to say how widely this worldview was shared. Key elements of it were rejected by some Jews (e.g. the Sadducees rejected the judgment of the dead). But neither was it peculiar to a particular sect or the product of a single movement."

32. Collins, "From Prophecy to Apocalypticism," 147–8.

33. See Anathea Portier-Young, *Apocalypse Against Empire: Theologies of Resistance in Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011).

34. Collins, "From Prophecy to Apocalypticism," 148.

35. Collins, "From Prophecy to Apocalypticism," 148–50.

I urge continued attention to two sets of data that may help us arrive at a clearer picture of the spread of apocalyptic worldviews in the second and first centuries BCE in particular. The first pertains to the Qumran scrolls. The second pertains to early Jewish novels.

A. Qumran scrolls

Florentino García Martínez and John J. Collins have both investigated apocalypticism in the scrolls discovered in the caves of Qumran by comparing the earliest known apocalypses (Daniel and the early Enochic literature) with writings among the scrolls that have been judged to have originated in the *yaḥad*. They highlight ways the earliest apocalypses influenced the writings of the *yaḥad*, and argue for continuity as well as development in such components of worldview as cosmology, etiology, and prediction. Both scholars characterize the worldviews they associate with these documents as apocalyptic.[36] What might this suggest to us about the spread of apocalyptic worldviews in the Hasmonean period in which the Qumran settlement is believed to have originated?[37]

The caches of scrolls discovered in the caves of Qumran have for many years been believed to be the library of a Qumran community. Based on this assumption, the scrolls were used by scholars to reconstruct the reading habits, attitudes, beliefs, and practices of the posited community. The Community Rule discovered in caves 1 and 4 (1QS, 4Q255–4Q264) was foundational for this reconstruction, as it was taken to be the rule for the settlement at Qumran. The community's restrictions on interactions with outsiders led many to the conclusion that the owners of these scrolls were relatively isolated from their cultural surroundings.[38] If this were the case, we might not expect the scrolls to tell us much about the spread of apocalyptic worldviews in this period beyond the datum that "people

36. Florentino García Martínez, "Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in John J. Collins (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism*, vol. 1, *The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity* (London: Continuum, 2000), 162–92, 190; John J. Collins, "Apocalypticism and Literary Genre in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in Peter Flint and James VanderKam (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, vol. 2 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 403–30; Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls.*

37. Jodi Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 66, dates the first phase of post-Iron Age settlement around 90 BCE.

38. Cf. Lester Grabbe's discussion of evidence for restricted interactions with outsiders among the Essenes as described by Philo and Josephus. "When is a Sect a Sect–Or Not?" in David Chalcraft (ed.), *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances* (London, Equinox; 2007), 114–32, 116–18. Grabbe notes that, despite reporting some restrictions, Josephus also names Essenes who were involved in various aspects of civic and political life and/or fought alongside nonsectarian Jews in the first Jewish revolt against Rome in the first century CE. Grabbe also notes that Josephus's reference to a group of Essenes that marry "might suggest a greater diversity" within the movement and higher levels of social interaction within local communities (117).

at Qumran had them and might have gotten them from traditions we associate with Jerusalem and (more distantly) Galilee." But recent scholarship has helped us to perceive possible links between the scrolls and a wider demographic set by emphasizing three points.

First, scholars have emphasized that many of the scrolls do not exhibit distinctive features associated with the writings of the *yaḥad* (including Tobit, to which I return below), while some that do may have predated their deposit at Qumran. More recent scholarship has also reexamined and challenged the assumption that the scrolls formed a library as such.[39] It has been argued, for example, that the scrolls may have been brought to Qumran for safe keeping or hiding at critical moments of danger. Some scrolls may have been the possessions of individuals who arrived at Qumran for other reasons, perhaps to join the settlement temporarily or permanently.[40] Regardless of the circumstances, the presence at Qumran of texts that did not originate with the *yaḥad* suggests a variety of avenues for the transmission of texts, ideas, and worldviews in ancient Judea and its environs.

Moreover, evidence from Josephus, Philo, and the scrolls themselves, as well as from the closely related Damascus Document, suggests that the *yaḥad* consisted not of a single community but many, including discrete settlements as well as groups of followers in urban locations.[41] David Chalcraft has explored some implications of possible travel by some members of the movement between settlement-communities as well as urban areas, whether for recruitment, to visit friends or families, or for other reasons.[42]

In addition, Alison Schofield has recently argued that these communities were not as isolated as has previously been assumed. Drawing on the work of social anthropologist Robert Redfield, she argues that the settlement at Qumran and other communities described in the Community Rule and Damascus Covenant would have been interconnected with nearby Jerusalem in particular, with a regular, dynamic exchange of ideas and literature between center and periphery.[43]

39. See survey and discussion in Alison Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yaḥad: A New Paradigm of Textual Development for The Community Rule* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 51–9.

40. Yaacov Shavit, "The 'Qumran Library' in the Light of the Attitude towards Books and Libraries in the Second Temple Period," *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 722/1 (1994): 299–317; Mladen Popović, "Qumran as Scroll Storehouse in Times of Crisis? A Comparative Perspective on Judaean Desert Manuscript Collections," *JSJ* 43 (2012): 551–94.

41. See John J. Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010). Cf. Torleif Elgvin, "The *Yaḥad* is More than Qumran," in Gabriele Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 273–9.

42. Chalcraft, "Towards a Weberian Sociology," 88–9.

43. Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yaḥad*, 48–50. Cf. Eric Meyers, "Khirbet Qumran and its Environs," in Timothy Lim and John J. Collins (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of the*

The *yaḥad*'s possible trans- or multi-locality suggests a wider geographic range for the apocalyptic worldview commonly attributed to the writers of the sectarian documents found among the Dead Sea Scrolls. This wider geographic range, along with growing evidence for restricted but nonetheless significant interactions between members of the *yaḥad* and nonmembers, implies a greater number of vectors for contact with nonsectarian populations in various locales. These vectors would have contributed to the exchange and spread of ideas and concomitant transformations and potential spread of apocalyptic worldviews.

B. Early Jewish novels

Other, perhaps less obvious, data for assessing the extent and spread of apocalyptic worldviews in the Seleucid and Hasmonean period emerge from the study of early Jewish novels, in particular Greek Daniel and Tobit.

In the case of Daniel, Lawrence Wills argues that just as the addition of apocalyptic visions (Dan. 7–12) transformed a collection of tales into an apocalypse, so the subsequent addition of *Susanna* and *Bel and the Dragon* as a frame for Greek Daniel transformed an apocalypse into a novel.[44] What might this transformation suggest about the spread and transformations of apocalyptic worldviews in this period? The book's novelistic form suggests modes of consumption characterized by leisure rather than imminent danger. Its translation and development into a novel for a Greek-speaking audience further suggests movement across sociolinguistic boundaries related to class, culture, and/or region.

In the case of Tobit, we do not have an apocalypse transformed into a novel, but a novel that contains a high number of apocalyptic motifs. In the essay "Tobit and Enoch: Distant Cousins with a Recognizable Resemblance," George W. E. Nickelsburg compared Tobit and 1 Enoch's "cosmology, angelology, and demonology; their eschatology; their ethical teaching; and their liturgical vocabulary."[45] He concluded that the two works likely shared "a common stock of ideas, traditions, and terminology" from outside the Hebrew Scriptures.[46] He finds allusions to "the heavenly world" in references to angels, the holy ones, and divine glory at Tobit 3:16-17; 8:15; 11:14; 12:12-15.[47] He calls attention to similarities between the story of Raphael's binding and shackling of the demon Asmodeus in Tobit 8:3 and Raphael's binding of Asael in 1 Enoch 10:4, as well as such shared motifs as attraction of otherworldly beings to human women and the revelation of

Dead Sea Scrolls (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 21–45, 42. Meyers discusses evidence for the settlement's "participation in the larger cultural milieu."

44. Lawrence Wills, *The Jewish Novel in the Ancient World* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1995), 40–92.

45. *SBLSP* 1988, 54–68; reprinted in Neusner and Avery-Peck (eds.), *George W. E. Nickelsburg in Perspective*, 217–39. I cite from the reprint edition.

46. Nickelsburg, "Tobit and Enoch," 218–19.

47. Nickelsburg, "Tobit and Enoch," 222–3.

healing arts by heavenly beings.[48] Tobit's eschatology, in Nickelsburg's reading, shares features with the *Apocalypse of Weeks*, including the burning of the temple, building of an eschatological temple, and destruction of the wicked.[49] The reference in Tobit's final speech to the "times" in which foreseen events will take place suggests a temporal determinism similar to that found in the *Apocalypse of Weeks*.[50] Nickelsburg also discerns a crucial role for angelic revelation in Tobit. He writes:

> Although it would not be helpful to suggest that the book of Tobit is formally an apocalypse, what the book does claim to know about the activity of the heavenly world and the world's impingement on human life is, in fact, ascribed to an angelic revelation.[51]

Stefan Beyerle has further investigated Tobit's eschatology.[52] He finds two streams within the book, one focused on Tobit and his family, the other focused on Jerusalem and the people of Israel. The hopes of Tobit and his family and the hopes of Jerusalem and Israel run parallel to one another as the book unfolds. By its end, one may begin to connect the two streams, situating the family's future within a broader eschatological frame.[53]

Scholars have not achieved consensus concerning the place of composition for Tobit. Some have argued that it was written for an audience in Diaspora, while others have argued for a Palestinian provenance.[54] We know that Tobit circulated in Judea to some extent in the Hasmonean period: fragments of Tobit 7:11 and 14:10 (4QTob^{d} ar) from Qumran cave four have have been dated c. 100 BCE.[55] Fragments of four other later (Herodian) copies have been preserved at Qumran, including fragments of one Hebrew translation. Yet the book shows no sectarian tendencies. Moreover, later Greek and Hebrew manuscripts from a variety of Diaspora settings suggest wide circulation and a lively transmission history.

48. Nickelsburg, "Tobit and Enoch," 220–1.

49. Nickelsburg, "Tobit and Enoch," 227.

50. Nickelsburg, "Tobit and Enoch," 228.

51. Nickelsburg, "Tobit and Enoch," 237. In a later essay Nickelsburg suggested further that Tobit's mixture of sapiential and apocalyptic elements provides fertile ground for continued exploration of the relation between apocalyptic and sapiential worldviews. George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Wisdom and Apocalypticism in Early Judaism: Some Points for Discussion," in Jacob Neusner and Alan J. Avery-Peck (eds.), *George W. E. Nickelsburg in Perspective: An Ongoing Dialogue of Learning* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 267–87.

52. Stefan Beyerle, "'Release Me To Go To My Everlasting Home …' (Tob. 3:6): A Belief in an Afterlife in Late Wisdom Literature?" in Géza Xeravits and József Zsengellér (eds), *The Book of Tobit: Text, Tradition, Theology* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 71–88.

53. Beyerle, "Release Me," 88.

54. A survey of scholarly proposals can be found in Joseph Fitzmyer, *Tobit* (CEJL; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003), 52–4.

55. Fitzmyer, *Tobit*, 10–11.

Although we cannot say for certain where Tobit originated or who was reading it where and when in the Hellenistic period, we might reasonably infer a wider readership beyond the Qumran settlement. Scholars of ancient novelistic literature have theorized that its consumers in the Hellenistic period included literate elites; these included members of a new urban merchant class.[56] The episodic structure and other stylistic features of ancient novels suggest that literate individuals may have recited novels orally for a wider, non- or semi-literate audience.[57]

The novel, like the apocalypse, emerged under specific cultural conditions in the Hellenistic period. Alexander's conquest of the Persian empire created a new, quasi-global social matrix of intensified cultural contact throughout the Mediterranean and Near East.[58] Jews and non-Jews alike negotiated benefits and challenges of shifting class structures, cultural boundaries, and political climates. Wars, military occupation, social unrest (including riots, revolts, banditry, and piracy), the growth of urban centers, and expanding trade routes contributed to the development and popularity of ancient novelistic literature.[59]

These same conditions also provided occasions for the transformation and spread of worldviews within and across religious, social, ethnic, geographic, and cultural boundaries. In the final section of the paper I survey insights from social sciences into how ideas spread and suggest their implications for our study of apocalyptic worldviews in the Seleucid and Hasmonean periods.

5. How ideas spread like diseases and other insights from social sciences

Five decades ago, geographer Andre Siegfried theorized that ideas and ideologies spread in a manner analogous to the spread of diseases.[60] Siegfried argued that,

56. Ewen Bowie, "The Ancient Readers of the Greek Novels," in G. L. Schmeling (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 87–106; and Susan Stephens, "Who Reads Ancient Novels?" in J. Tatum (ed.), *The Search for the Ancient Novel* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994), 405–18. Each of these essays also explores the extent to which women were a primary audience for the ancient novels.

57. Tomas Hägg, "Orality, Literacy, and the 'Readership' of the Early Greek Novel," in *Parthenope: Selected Studies in Ancient Greek Fiction (1969–2004)* (Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2004), 109–40.

58. Robartus J. van der Spek, "The Hellenistic Near East," in Walter Scheidel, Ian Morris and Richard Saller (eds), *The Cambridge Economic History of the Greco-Roman World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 409–33, 410. See Peregrine Horden and Nicholas Purcell, *The Corrupting Sea: A Study of Mediterranean History* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000), for an account of the remarkable diversity and connectivity of the Mediterranean world; and W. V. Harris (ed.), *Rethinking the Mediterranean* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005) for interaction with their argument and further attention to questions of connectivity.

59. Hägg, *The Novel in Antiquity*, 83–6.

60. Andre Siegfried, *Germs and Ideas: Routes of Epidemics and Ideologies* (Edinburgh:

as with diseases, so with ideas and beliefs one could identify and analyze carriers, routes, and the impact of environmental conditions as well as the "immune system" of a society, group, or individual.[61] Others have since built on this model, contributing further categories of analysis, including the ways ideas and beliefs change as they spread and the impact of competing ideas or worldviews.[62]

Of particular importance for our study of apocalyptic worldviews is the model's emphasis on the role of *human agency*: no matter how literate a culture, it remains the case across cultures and periods that people, not texts, are the primary means by which ideas and beliefs spread.[63] People may contribute to the spread of ideas both consciously and unconsciously, directly and indirectly. Preachers, teachers, prophets, and priests are professional "carriers," although certainly not the only kind.[64] We might imagine in this role Daniel's *maskilim*, the chosen witnesses mentioned in the *Apocalypse of Weeks*, or the lambs who cry out to the other lambs in the *Book of Dream Visions*. We might also think of the Teacher of Righteousness and other similar roles referred to in the Community Rule and other Qumran documents.

Journalist Malcolm Gladwell highlights the activity of three different kinds of individual in the spread of ideas: mavens, connectors, and salespeople. Mavens invest heavily in gathering knowledge and sharing it with others. They are simultaneously teachers and students. Mavens are often a source of ideas that are spread further by connectors and salespersons. Connectors link disparate social networks through weak social ties and bring together people who would not otherwise be likely to interact. By facilitating interaction across group boundaries they contribute to the spread of ideas as well as the development of innovative syntheses. Salespeople are charismatic communicators, gifted at persuading others to adopt an idea, behavior, or belief.[65] Gladwell's typology does not exhaust the kinds of individual who influence the spread of ideas and worldviews, but it helpfully focuses our attention on how individuals may contribute to the spread of ideas in different places, times, and circumstances.

Luís Bettencourt, Ariel Cintrón-Arias, David Kaiser, and Carlos Castillo-Chávez apply a more sophisticated epidemiological model to their study of the spread of ideas. Individuals can occupy various classes in relation to the idea or

Oliver & Boyd, 1965). The same insight informs the work of Aaron Lynch in *Thought Contagion: How Belief Spreads Through Society: The New Science of Memes* (New York: Basic Books, 1996).

61. Siegfried, *Germs and Ideas*, 85–98.

62. A technical treatment can be found in Luís M. A. Bettencourt, Ariel Cintrón-Arias, David I. Kaiser, and Carlos Castillo-Chávez, "The Power of a Good Idea: Quantitative Modeling of the Spread of Ideas from Epidemiological Models," *Physica A* (2005): 513–36; a popular treatment can be found in Malcolm Gladwell, *The Tipping Point: How Little Things Can Make a Big Difference* (New York: Little, Brown and Company, 2000).

63. Bettencourt et al., "Power of a Good Idea,"24.

64. Siegfried, *Germs and Ideas*, 86.

65. Gladwell, *Tipping Point*, 18–88.

worldview. A very basic model has four classes: susceptible, exposed, incubating (this period can include a program of ongoing learning or apprenticeship), and adopter. An important finding of Bettencourt et al. is that multiple contacts with people who have adopted an idea lead to both a higher likelihood of adopting the same idea and a shorter period from exposure to adoption.[66] That is, more social interactions across groups will cause ideas to spread more quickly.

Various environmental and social factors promote the spread of ideas and worldviews. Cities and towns are a primary, but not sole, locus of contact and innovation.[67] Civic and other public meeting spaces such as city gates, markets, synagogues, proseuchai, fora, agorai, temple courts, and squares, as well as dedicated buildings and areas for meetings of voluntary associations, all contribute to the spread of ideas.[68] Public works such as sanitation and provisions for clean water reduce the spread of diseases and thereby promote public interaction. Proximity to travel routes, including navigable waterways, similarly contributes to the spread of ideas and development of new syntheses.[69] Favorable weather conditions bring people out onto roads and waterways and into public spaces, leading ideas to spread more quickly.[70]

Local, regional, and international travel all play a role in the spread and transformations of ideas and worldviews.[71] Reasons for and types of travel varied widely, as they do today. They included commerce, religious pilgrimage and festivals, and visiting family (including family events such as weddings and funerals) or other personal contacts. One might travel in search of food, labor, or

66. Bettencourt et al., "Power of a Good Idea," 24.

67. Luís M. A. Bettencourt, José Lobo, Dirk Helbing, Christian Kühnert, and Geoffrey B. West, "Growth, Innovation, Scaling, and the Pace of Life in Cities," *Proceedings of the National Academy of the Sciences of the USA* 104 (2007): 7301–6. Alain Bresson, "Ecology and Beyond; The Mediterranean Paradigm," in Harris (ed.), *Rethinking the Mediterranean*, 94–114, cautions against overemphasizing the contrasts between city and country or waterway and hinterland.

68. The communal dining hall at Khirbet Qumran (L77) might fall into this category. On the synagogue, see Lee Levine, *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000). Levine argues that in the Hellenistic period activities that previously took place in the gate and square shifted to a building that came to be called the synagogue (32).

69. Kenneth Sokoloff, "Inventive Activity in Early Industrial America: Evidence from Patent Records, 1790–1846," NBER Working Paper, *Journal of Economic History* 48 (1988): 813–50. Cf. Siegfried, *Germs and Ideas*, 89–90.

70. Gladwell, *Tipping Point*, 32.

71. On travel in antiquity, see Lionel Casson, *Travel in the Ancient World* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1974); Renate Schleiser and Ulrike Zellmann (eds), *Mobility and Travel in the Mediterranean from Antiquity to the Middle Ages* (Münster: Lit, 2004); Jaś Elsner and Ian Rutherford (eds), *Pilgrimage in Graeco-Roman And Early Christian Antiquity: Seeing the Gods* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005); Catherine Hezser, *Jewish Travel in Antiquity* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011).

safety during periods of famine, economic change, or danger. One might travel as a student, soldier, messenger, administrator, or tourist. One could relocate for a longer period of time as a result of colonization, displacement, captivity, or exile. As Catherine Hezser notes, "Mobility in and of itself and as a means of facilitating communication over more or less large distances would have had a significant impact on social, economic, cultural, religious, and literary developments in ancient Jewish society."[72] Improvements and investments in such technologies of travel as roads and ships allowed people to traverse longer distances and exchange ideas more widely.[73]

Economic and social unrest can make a population more open to new ideas and worldviews: the former worldviews may be perceived to be unable adequately to account for or respond to the new conditions, generating an openness to new explanations and solutions. Other contributing factors can be youth (young people have been shown to be, neurologically and sociologically speaking, more open on average to new ideas), cultural practices of hospitality, and intentional networks for communication and education. With regard to the latter, Bettencourt et al. have noted that communities where ideas spread fastest are those that "created intentional social and behavioral structures that ensured very efficient communication of scientific knowledge" (the *yaḥad* comes to mind).[74]

At the same time, stability and prosperity conduce to conservatism (here again, the *yaḥad* comes to mind, but also, in a different way, the Hasmonean dynasty). If the former worldview appears to be working well, there is no need to change it. Other factors that may inhibit the spread of new worldviews include small population size, geographic isolation, epidemics, and harsh weather conditions, all of which lead to fewer contacts and thereby slow or halt the spread of ideas. Skeptics may actively work to debunk an idea or worldview or promote a competing set of ideas or worldviews. A person or group may adopt an idea or worldview but may find it unhelpful and later revise or reject it.[75] Alternately, a government may take measures to halt the spread of ideas through such means as killing, exile, placing limits on immigration, commerce, or public gathering, censorship, surveillance, containment (including imprisonment), propaganda, and reeducation.[76] Yet, as has often been shown and as appears to have been the case in 167 BCE, these measures may have the opposite of the intended effect. More commonly, "softer" forms of the worldview, idea, or norm find wide acceptance

72. Hezser, *Jewish Travel in Antiquity*, 3.

73. On the relation between trade and exchange of ideas, see Jeremy Sabloff and C. C. Lamberg-Karlovsky (eds), *Ancient Civilization and Trade* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1975). On roads, see David Dorsey, *The Roads and Highways of Ancient Israel* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991); cf. Ray Laurence, *The Roads of Roman Italy: Mobility and Cultural Change* (London: Routledge, 1999).

74. Bettencourt et al. "Power of a good idea," 27.

75. Bettencourt et al., "Power of a Good Idea," 9.

76. Siegfried, *Germs and Ideas*, 92–3.

and can, for the time being, "inoculate" large portions of the population against more radical versions of the same.[77]

This summary of insights from the application of epidemiological models to the spread of ideas and worldviews is meant to stimulate reflection and further study of the many factors in play as we attempt to determine the extent of apocalyptic worldviews in the Seleucid and Hasmonean periods.

Summary

This article proposed that the conditions of empire in the Hellenistic period facilitated the genesis and spread of an apocalyptic worldview. In Judea, the formation of the Hasmonean state precipitated further revisions in the worldview of various social groups and strata. Several aspects of the question were dealt with. Part 1 inquired into the use of the phrase "apocalyptic worldview" by modern scholars who study ancient Judaism. Part 2 focused on the second part of the phrase and surveyed scholarship from a range of fields concerning the meaning and function of "worldview." Several conclusions arose from this:

1. A worldview may be proper to a social group or an individual. Worldviews are not proper to texts, nor do texts and worldviews have a one-to-one correspondence. They do not develop in isolation.
2. Worldviews entail assumptions about self, other, relationship, classification, causality, space, and time. They draw on existing traditions, concepts, and symbols.
3. Worldviews provide meaning and guidance. Sharing a worldview with a group can yield security and a sense of shared identity.
4. Worldviews are transmitted or communicated through a variety of means, including social interactions, written texts, architecture, and iconography.
5. Worldviews are constantly in flux and take effort to construct, maintain, and revise. Limit situations challenge existing worldviews and can lead to changes in worldview.

Part 3 proposed implications of this survey for how we might think about "apocalyptic worldview(s)". Part 4 highlighted new perspectives on the Qumran scrolls and aspects of early Jewish novelistic literature that form the spread of apocalyptic worldviews in the Hellenistic period. Part 5 surveyed social-scientific scholarship on the spread of ideas and ideologies to determine how a worldview might spread.

77. Jochen Prantl and Ryoko Nakano, "Global Norm Diffusion in East Asia: How China and Japan Implement the Responsibility to Protect," *International Relations* 25:2 (2011): 204–23, 210. The literature on global norm diffusion offers other potentially helpful insights for our study, particularly with regard to the relationship between old and new worldviews, processes of localization, and feedback loops at local, regional, and global levels.

Response to Portier-Young

Edward Dąbrowa

One of the great problems facing the humanities and social sciences is the language of description, methods of research, classification, and interpretation of all available data. It is much easier to confirm a hypothesis in the applied sciences. Through physical, chemical, medical, or biological experiments, scholars can easily verify their theories and present results to the public with a very detailed description of the procedures used. Discussing and interpreting matters related to social relations, religious practices, or political stances is sometimes a tortuous effort. The language of description is usually less precise and more elusive, and the notions used by scholars in their interpretations frequently have different meanings. This explains why in the humanities and social sciences so many scholars are trying to offer new research methods or interpretation using tools which are constructed and used by different sciences. An effect of these efforts is that an interdisciplinary approach to specific problems is now the rule. The main reason for the efforts to implement new research tools for specific fields of study is the hope that these will give us a better understanding of complicated social, historical, or religious phenomena, not only in the world around us but also in the past. One of the essential conditions necessary for achieving success is scholarly language based on clear and precise notions.

The aims of Anathea Portier-Young's paper are to define some notions used in discussion in studies on apocalypticism in ancient Judaism and promote some new methods of interpretation of data and phenomena related to apocalypticism in the Hasmonean period. In the first part of her study, she proposes introducing and using some new notions in discussion on the apocalypses: apocalypses, apocalypticism, and apocalyptic worldview. This proposal makes it possible to avoid the unnecessary misunderstandings that are quite frequent when concepts used by scholars have different meanings depending on the specific context.

In the second and third parts of her paper, Portier-Young discusses the problem of the relationship between apocalyptic texts and the worldviews of their authors. According to her, "worldviews are not proper to texts, nor do texts and worldviews have one-to-one correspondences." To confirm this opinion, she presents a number of arguments in favor of elements which have had an impact on the worldview of the authors of apocalypses. After a survey of scholarship, including philosophy, sociology, psychology, cultural anthropology, theology, and linguistics, Portier-Young lists five points which she believes must be taken into consideration in discussion on apocalyptic worldviews: people or texts, content, function, transmission, and change. Each of these points is important, and in its own right deserves the attention of scholars. But this is possible only when we have enough information on each of them. In a theoretical model based on the results of research on present societies this may be possible thanks to data collected during a long observation period. For ancient times, the majority of these points can be interpreted only superficially with a large amount of

speculation, and the conclusions drawn will always be hypothetical in character. Discussing the apocalyptical worldviews of ancient authors, we must use—and this seems logical, and the only appropriate method—their texts as expressions of their theological concepts, because only from these texts are we able to discover these views, not vice versa. To me, the list looks like a questionnaire which it is impossible to complete for the Hasmonean period, for the simple reason that we have at our disposal a very limited set of sources, and any proposed model of interpretation does not fill gaps in our knowledge of this period. It is necessary to add that the abovementioned list of factors shaping apocalyptic worldviews might also be useful for scholars researching eschatological or messianistic worldviews, as it is more universal in character than the author suggests.

In my opinion, the proposed concept of worldview as a method of researching apocalypticism and interpreting the apocalypses has some limits which we must not overlook. On the one hand, Portier-Young stresses that in fact we are confronted not with one apocalyptic worldview but with many. On the other, the worldview of each author, influenced by many factors—personal, social, economic, or political, generally speaking non-apocalyptical—was in a steady process of evolution. In fact, we are not able to say at which moment of this evolution he had written his apocalyptical manifesto, or if, after writing, his views evolved in a much more radical direction or changed to become more balanced. Another essential question to which we are not able to respond with complete certainty is how many streams of apocalypticism coexisted in Judea in the Hasmonean period, and to which of these streams the authors of known apocalypses belonged; even Portier-Young is aware of this problem. We must not neglect or overlook this, as its importance is crucial not only for interpretation of each of these streams, but also for apocalypticism as a religious phenomenon.

In the fourth part of her paper, Portier-Young deals with the problem of the apocalyptic worldview beyond the apocalypses, using the Qumran scrolls and Tobit, a novel containing apocalyptic motifs, as two case studies. She argues that the presence of several apocalyptic texts among the Qumran scrolls is proof that apocalyptic worldviews were represented in the Qumran community, and that the relations of members of this community with other communities, and especially with Jerusalem, were instrumental for dissemination of apocalyptic ideas in Judea. In the case of Tobit, arguments that the novel was used for presenting apocalyptic ideas to different groups of readers are founded on the fact that some fragments of this work were found in Qumran. The author speculates that the novel had a wide circulation and "may have recited … for a wider audience, non- or semi-literate audience." It seems, though, that the validity of this observation is appropriate only for the late Hasmonean period. According to Portier-Young, both the case studies lead to the conclusion that apocalyptical ideas were known to a much greater audience than has generally been accepted to date. In my opinion, neither of the cases is well chosen, and for this reason they do not convincingly support Porter-Young's arguments.

The academic debate on the character of the Qumran community is still ongoing, and the views expressed are sometimes dramatically different. The same

situation applies to the problem of authorship and origins of the whole corpus of the Qumran scrolls, like individual texts. In recent years, scholars have presented many hypotheses and interpretations on the scrolls and their origins that are different from the canonical views accepted in scholarship on Qumran. A new one was recently presented by Joan E. Taylor ("Buried Manuscripts and Empty Tombs: The Qumran *Genizah* Theory Revisited," in A. M. Meir, J. Magness and L. H. Schiffman (eds), *"Go Out and Study the Land" (Judges 18:2). Archaeological, Historical and Textual Studies in Honor of Hanan Eshel* [Leiden: Boston, 2012], 269–315). Not only for reasons of the variety of hypotheses concerning the Qumran library, Porter-Young's arguments on dissemination of apocalyptical ideas by the Qumran community must be treated with some distance. It is a well-known fact that among the Qumran scrolls it was not only apocalyptical, but also eschatological and messianic texts that were found. When estimating the importance of the apocalyptic worldview of the Qumranites, this fact must not be neglected or overlooked.

In the last part of her paper, Portier-Young discusses the problem of models of spreading of apocalyptic ideas. To present some observations, she uses theories elaborated by scholars dealing with diseases. I do not deny that the methodological apparatus constructed and developed within the field of medicine can be useful also for scholars dealing with ideas or religions, as far as it concerns the manner in which they spread. But as I am a historian I must express reservations over the use of medical models for interpretation of the social, religious, or historical phenomena in Hasmonean Judea. Judea in that period was a mainly rural country where the majority of people lived in small and dispersed villages and were adherents of traditional religiosity, rather conservative than revolutionary. Only these factors are important enough to be treated as a serious obstacle for the epidemic spread of new religious ideas. On the other hand, we must take into account that even if the apocalyptic ideas were popularized by some people or groups, this does not mean that they immediately found great resonance in the whole society. Oral transmission and dissemination of apocalyptical ideas were efficient to some extent, but certainly not enough to gain a great number of adherents in a short time. We may speculate over what religious life looked like in Judea in the Hasmonean period, but apocalypticism certainly was not its main stream, because at the same time an eschatological worldview and messianic worldview also emerged in Judea.

Certainly with the assistance of mathematical and medical models and theories, scholars are able to better describe the spread of diseases, but scholars dealing with social behaviors or religious ideas are not always aware of their logic.

The course of each epidemic is a closed circle. After reaching its peak, the epidemic retreats and weakens, before dying out completely. We should also add that, even when it is spreading most intensively in a given place, not all residents will be affected. If we apply an epidemiological model to research on religious phenomena we must remember that each apocalyptic worldview is a phenomenon occurring within a limited time and space. We should therefore study not only its expansion phase, but also that of its decline, to which scholars

often fail to pay attention. Only a complete picture of the development and decline of a specific apocalyptic worldview would permit us to assess its influence both on the growth and transformation of Judaism and on attitudes of the inhabitants of Judea in particular historical situations. The theoretical model is without doubt a useful tool for illustrating the course of this phenomenon, but it cannot replace the need to define those factors which led one of these apocalyptic worldviews to gain more popularity and be more lasting than others.

There were always (one or more) specific causes—religious, social, and political—lying at the root of every apocalyptic worldview. Apart from very general points, Portier-Young hardly discusses the reasons for the appearance and popularity of apocalyptic worldviews in the Hasmonean period at all. This is also lacking in her book *Apocalypse Against Empire: Theologies of Resistance in Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids, 2011). The vision the author creates of the Seleucids' ubiquitous terror towards the Jews living in Judea, formed on the basis of analysis and interpretation of Jewish religious texts mostly dating to the second century BCE, is exceptionally evocative, but has little to do with the historical realities of the period. Historians have shown unequivocally that the theological view of the origins of the Maccabees does not fit what the era is known to have looked like in reality (cf. S. Honigman, *Tales of High Priests and Taxes. The Books of the Maccabees and the Judean Rebellion against Antiochus IV* [Oakland: University of California Press, 2014]).

Anathea Portier-Young's methodological deliberations on the essence of the notion of "apocalyptic worldviews" and ways to study this phenomenon will no doubt be of interest to scholars working on this subject. However, a fundamental deficiency in her arguments is the fact that she does not apply her model to explain convincingly the cause of the emergence and popularity of apocalyptic views in the Hasmonean period.

RESPONSE TO PORTIER-YOUNG

Torleif Elgvin

Portier-Young should be commended for her thorough use of different scholarly models to understand the spread of worldviews in the second and first centuries BCE. Her discussion of the relation between group and individual with regard to development and change of worldview and belief is helpful. I will concentrate my response on three main issues.

1. Phenomenology of apocalypticism and prophecy

Portier-Young is to be commended for her wide approach. She does not only relate to apocalyptic literature as written material. However, this otherwise comprehensive paper does not discuss the phenomenology of the apocalyptic mind, and I would like to supplement her argument.

As most of her predecessors in scholarly discussion of apocalyptic literature and early mystical tradition, she refrains from going into the phenomenology of mysticism. Collins's groundbreaking volume from 1979 (*Semeia* 14) relates to apocalypses as literature, and hardly asks about the mind and self-understanding of the authors. Collins's interest lies in the texts and their ideas, not in the personal experiences of the apocalyptics.[1] As another example, Halperin talks about "distinguishing consciously created fantasy from unconsciously created hallucination … To the degree to which the symbols of the vision are outside the writer's conscious control, we may assume that the vision itself is outside his conscious control."[2] In his standard introduction to early Jewish mystical texts, Schäfer refrains from asking about the authors' possible mystical experiences. He defines his project as a literary one. And it remains unaccessible to him if the authors did have real mystical experiences, even if he cannot exclude it, especially in the case of Ezekiel. Therefore he discusses the texts as exegetical scribal products, and preserves a distance to McGinn's and Alexander's definitions of mysticism and mystical experience, from which he started out in his investigation. McGinn defines mysticism as a direct and immediate experience of the divine. Alexander notes three characteristics of religious mysticism: 1) A direct experience of a transcendent (divine) presence; 2) the mystic intensely desires a close relation to and communion with the divine presence; 3) mysticism always requires a *via mystica*, a way or method by which the mystic can experience such a communion.[3]

1. J. J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination. An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 99–100, 153.

2. D. J. Halperin, "Heavenly Ascension in Judaism: The Nature of the Experience," SBLSP 26 (1987): 218–32, 226.

3. P. Schäfer, *The Origins of Jewish Mysticism* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 7–8, 337–8; B. McGinn, *The Foundations of Mysticism*. Vol. 1: *The Presence of God: A History of*

An exception to the pure textual approach to apocalypticism is Rowland's work *The Open Heaven*.[4] Further, some recent books dare to go deeper into the phenomenology of mysticism and prophecy.[5] Here Fletcher-Louis suggests understanding many visionary writers as exegetes and mystics at the same time in light of Ricoeur's concept of *mimesis* as a priori condition for human understanding:

> what John [in Revelation] encounters in his visionary experience is made sense of through the framework of understanding *already present* in his cognition.
>
> the interpretation of Ezek. 1 … involved seeing again what Ezekiel had seen. It may well have involved the resort to cross-referencing, but this contributed to a dynamic imaginative activity in which the details of Ezekiel's vision were understood by a complex interweaving of vision and textual networking.[6]

As one example, John of Patmos is a visionary with a scriptural and exegetical pre-understanding. He is an exegete also when he writes down his visions. Subsequently his visions and auditions of the heavenly hymns become formative for understanding and liturgy both in the seven churches and wider circles within early Christianity. DeConick comments:

> It makes no difference to me whether or not we describe these narratives of the heroes as literary or experiential literature … early Jews and Christians who were reading these texts believed that the stories were reports of actual encounters with God. The images and descriptions in these texts deeply affected the way that the early Jews and first Christians described and interpreted their own perceived experiences and the way they framed their hopes for future experiences.[7]

We need to take more seriously the mystical, experiential side of apocalyptic and prophetic writing and piety. Portier-Young says that worldview is transmitted "through social interactions and practices such as ritual, song, and prayer … architecture and iconography, postures and hierarchies, modes of dress, and economic choices." Behind many of the texts and contexts we here refer to, "ritual,

Western Christian Mysticism (New York: Crossroad, 1991), xiii–xx; P. Alexander, *Mystical Texts* (London: T&T Clark, 2006), 8.

4. C. Rowland, *The Open Heaven. A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (New York: Crossroad, 1982).

5. *Paradise Now: Essays on Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism* (A.D. DeConick, ed.; Atlanta: SBL, 2006); *Experientia*, vol. 1. *Inquiry into Religious Experience in Early Judaism and Early Christianity* (F. Flannery, C. Shantz, R.A. Werline, eds.; Atlanta: SBL, 2008); C. Shantz, *Paul in Ecstasy: The Neurobiology of the Apostle's Life and Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

6. C. Fletcher-Louis, "Visionary Experience in Ancient Judaism and Christianity," *Paradise Now*, 41–56, 45, 48; idem, "Religious Experience and the Apocalypses," *Experientia*, 125–44.

7. "What is Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism?" *Paradise Now*, 1–24, 7.

song, and prayer" would include prophecy and experience of "lesser mystical states."[8] Terms such as ecstacy and hallucination (Halperin) are hardly helpful to understand these early mystical minds. We need to ask questions such as: To which extent did early Enochic writers conceive of themselves as online in the spirit with Enoch in the heavens? Did Enochic and Danielic authors know about mystical or prophetic experience and activity, as Paul, John of Patmos, the author of the *Gabriel Inscription*,[9] and the circles behind *Assumptio Isaiah* clearly did.

2. Sociological causes for the explosion of apocalypticism in second-century Judea

The "Qumran library" testifies to an explosion of writing of Jewish literature in the second century and a renaissance of Hebrew as a literary language. Jewish apocalyptic literature comes to the surface in the third century (earliest parts of 1 Enoch) and more broadly in the second century. What are the causal factors for these developments?

Portier-Young notes that Jewish communities experienced crisis situations in the Seleucid and Hasmonean periods, including war, terror, occupation, encounter with death, and other types of personal and social struggle, and that such experience would allow for developing and changing existing worldviews and ideas, both with individuals and communities. She follows S. Cook in suggesting that such events would create cognitive dissonance, a situation ripe for millennialism.

Even if the sources are scarce, it seems that Judea and Jerusalem experienced wars and invasions two or three times between 225 and 198 BCE (cf. Dan. 10:16). Then followed a more peaceful time under Antiochus III before the upheavals under Antiochus IV and the Maccabean Revolt. These experiences were formative for literature and apocalypticism in second-century Judea.

Then, the establishment of the Hasmonean state, a Jewish independent entity that rapidly expanded to a territory surpassing all previous Israelite historical experience, would cause messianic and apocalyptic fervor.[10] Hyrcanus's and Janneus's territorial expansion of the Judean state would be seen by many as signs of the coming messianic age; the end would be close at hand. Hyrcanus's razing to the ground of the Samaritans' city Shechem and their temple on Garizim would easily be connected to texts referring to the Son of David's victory over the enemies of God's people (Ps. 2; 110, Mic. 5:1-5). The Judaization of Galilee, Golan,

8. The term is taken from Shantz, *Paul in Ecstacy*, 119.

9. See T. Elgvin, "Eschatology and Messianism in the Gabriel Inscription," *Journal of the Jesus Movement in Its Jewish Setting 1* (2014), 5–25.

10. T. Elgvin, "Hasmonean State Ideology, Wars, and Expansionism," in M. Zehnder and H. Hagelia (eds), *Encountering Violence in the Bible* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2013), 52–67; idem, "Violence, Apologetics, and Resistance: Hasmonaean Ideology and Yahad Texts in Dialogue," in K. Davis et al. (eds), *The War Scroll, Violence, War and Peace in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature* (STDJ 115; Leiden: Brill, 2015), 319–340.

and Idumea under Hyrcanus, Aristobulus, and Janneus (*Ant.* 13.318-19, 257-8, 395-7) would be perceived as fulfilment of biblical prophecies such as Am 9:12, Isaiah 2:1-4, and Zephaniah 3:9, on the inclusion of Edom and other neighboring peoples in the Israelite faith and commonwealth.

The rapid growth of Jewish settlements in Galilee and Golan in this period (evidenced in the foundation or enlargening of sites such as Gamla, Migdal, Arbel, and Sepphoris)[11] are usually explained by an influx of Judeans, including veterans from the Hasmonean army. In addition there were probably Jewish immigrants from the diaspora, not the least the Eastern diaspora, for which cf. Pss. Sol. 11. Such an immigration would mean exchange of ideas, literature, and new perspectives.[12]

Anti-Hasmonean dissidents would create their own counter-stories to the establishment theology of the Jerusalem rulers, evident in the laudatory hymns to Judah and Simon included in 1 Maccabees 3:3-9; 14:4-15. As Schofield has argued, the *Yahad* developed its worldview as a sociological "periphery" that related to Jerusalem and the temple establishment as "center."[13]

The *Vision of Gabriel* from the second half of the first century BCE is an illuminating apocalyptic text. The author recognizes both evil and angelic forces; he is dependent on angelic mediation, and foresees a military crisis in Jerusalem of the end-time, where angelic forces will come to the aid of Jerusalem and its messiah. The prophet behind this apocalyptic text was no supporter of the military might of the Hasmoneans or of Herod. He listens to a dialogue between God and the Davidic messiah in the context of the final war, a dialogue inspired by Psalm 2, and declares that "Jerusalem shall be as in former times" (line 32), thus hinting at the illegitimacy of the present leadership. I have recently argued that this text is not formatted in the time of an acute military crisis, but represents a vision of end-time Jerusalem. However, the author's experience of upheavals in first-century Judea may have colored his end-time scenario.[14]

According to J. Brenner, the priestly scribal group never recovered from the

11. U. Leibner, "The Origins of Jewish Settlement in Galilee in the Second Temple Period: Historical Sources and Archaeological Data" *Zion 77* (2012), 437–70 (Hebrew); D. Syon, *Small Change in Hellenistic-Roman Galilee. The Evidence From Numismatic Site Finds as a Tool for Historical Reconstruction* (Jerusalem: Israel Numismatic Society, 2015), 151–70; M. Aviam, "Distribution Maps of Archaeological Data from the Galilee: An Attempt to Establish Zones Indicative of Ethnicity and Religious Affiliation," in J. Zangenberg, H.W. Attridge, D.B. Martin (eds), *Religion, Ethnicity, and Identity in Ancient Galilee. A Region in Transition* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 115–32.

12. Cf. the suggestion by M. Aviam to connect the Enochic Similitudes and the final editing of 1 Enoch with the symbols on the decorated pulpit recently unearthed in the first century Migdal synagogue: "The Book of Enoch and the Galilean Archaeology and Landscape," in J.H. Charlesworth, D.L. Bock (eds), *Parables of Enoch. A Paradigm Shift* (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), 159–69.

13. A. Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yahad. A New Paradigm of Textual Development for* The Community Rule (STDJ 77; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 47–51, 274–5.

14. T. Elgvin, "Eschatology and Messianism in the Gabriel Inscription."

plundering of Jerusalem by Antiochus IV. Therefore, authority was transferred from the priests and scribes of the temple to the texts themselves.[15] I would add, not only to the texts, but also to the prophetic and apocalyptic carriers of the texts. Even if these texts used the reputation of biblical sages as an authority-conferring strategy, they were authored and transmitted by individuals with a strong self-consciousness, which for some was based not only on scribal knowledge, but also on mystical and "charismatic" experience.

Also establishment circles could have prophetic self-consciousness or refer to online connection between earth and heaven. Ben Sira is often placed at a distance from the apocalyptic circles behind the Enochic writings. But also he displays a prophetic self-consciousness. He spreads his teaching to contemporaries and future generations like the prophets, he is a channel into the "garden" (24:30–34). His encounter with Lady Wisdom was deep and penetrating, as the Hebrew text of 11QPs[a] Sir. 51 shows.

I have elsewhere argued that the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice reflect priestly and levitical theology of the pre-Maccabean temple, which perceived an online connection between the officiating priest and levitical singers with their heavenly counterparts.[16] Priestly tradition treasured the option of divine revelation to individuals in the temple.[17] Both the blessing of the high priest in 1QSb IV and the Self-Glorification Hymn testify to the idea of an online connection between the earthly and the heavenly sanctuary. These sanctuary concepts are much older than the development of apocalyptic thought. The development of apocalypticism may in part be explained through estrangement from the Jerusalem sanctuary and the concept of a "temple of man" as a substitute for the earthly sanctuary, either in an apocalyptic community or within individuals with a mystical self-understanding.

Further, we should not forget that biblical texts do refer to communication with heavenly beings way before the breakthrough of apocalyptic tradition. Revelation where angels (or YHWH's heavenly council) play a crucial role is reflected in texts such as 1 Kings 22:17-28; Isaiah 6:1-6; Jeremiah 23:18; Zechariah 1–6; Job 4:12-21; 15:8, cf. Psalm 89:8; Proverbs 3:32.

3. The Yahad—no isolated community

Portier-Young argues that the *Yahad* was no isolated community. As this writer

15. J. N. Brenner, "From Holy Books to Holy Bible: An Itinerary from Ancient Greece to Modern Islam via Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity," in M. Popovíc (ed.), *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism* (SupJSJ 141; Leiden: Brill, 2011), 327–60.

16. "Temple Mysticism and the Temple of Men," in C. Hempel (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Text and Context* (STDJ 90; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 227–42, esp. 236–7.

17. Ibid. Josephus reports revelations to the high priest Jaddus at the time of Alexander the Great (*Ant.* 11.326-8) and to Hyrcanus (*Ant.* 13.282-3). Rabbinic tradition refers to an angel appearing to the high priest in the sanctuary during the Yom Kippur liturgy. Cf. also Lk. 1:5-23; 2:25-38; Acts 7:55-56.

and Alison Schofield have argued, the *Yahad* was represented at different locations in Judea.[18]

Recent physical analysis of fragments in the Schøyen Collection gives additional light on this subject.[19] The small Schøyen fragments from Cave 1 (1QS, 1QSb, 1QIsa[a], the cover sheet of 1QIsa[a], and the repair sheet rolled between the external revolutions of 1QapGen) come from scrolls of cream-colored parchment of extraordinarily high quality. The skin had been lightly tanned in a process that utilized alum, similar to the practice in the Middle Ages.[20] The parchments of 1QS, 1QSb, 1QIsa[a], and the cover sheet of 1QIsa[a] have close to identical mineral features, suggesting that they were likely produced using advanced techniques at the same workshop. The techniques used for preparing these scrolls demonstrate that *Yahad* scribes were in close connection with top Judean expertise in the production of parchment by the early and mid-first century BCE.[21]

Eleven Schøyen fragments contained substantial amounts of lead. Lead was identified in the blank protective sheet of the *Genesis Apocryphon—but not in a tiny wad from 1QapGen itself.* Lead is not found naturally in Israel, but was used in water pipes in the Greco-Roman world. Water pipes that utilized imported lead have been identified in a few locations in Judea. *The presence of lead in* certain fragments suggests that they belonged to scrolls that were prepared in basins fed by leaden water pipes. This feature points to central locations in Judea as places where these skins and scrolls were prepared. Clearly many Qumran scrolls were not produced in isolated corners of Judean society that we tend to associate with the term "sectarian." In a Schøyen fragment assigned to 4QRP[b] (4Q364), substantial amounts of lead were identified in the ink, but not in the parchment, indicating that the ink was made in a different location from the parchment. A revised dating of the script of 4QRP[b] demonstrates that water pipes containing lead were in use in Judea already in the second half of the second century BCE.[22]

18. T. Elgvin, "The *Yahad* Is More Than Qumran," in G. Boccacini (ed.), *Enoch and Qumran Origins. New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 273–9; A. Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yahad*, 42–67, 266–81. Cf. Joan Taylor's presentation of the Essenes as an elite group in Judean Society: *The Essenes, the Scrolls, and the Dead Sea* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 195–201, 341–43.

19. T. Elgvin et al. (eds), *Gleanings from the Caves. Dead Sea Scrolls and Artefacts in The Schøyen Collection* (T&T Clark, forthcoming).

20. Unlike the Cave 1 fragments, most of the fragments in The Schøyen Collection are of a different kind of parchment, containing more potassium and less sulfur compared with the Cave 1 fragments. The skins of these fragments have undergone vegetable tanning; the parchments are brown in colour and usually of a poorer quality than the first group. See Ira Rabin, "Material Analysis of the Fragments," forthcoming in *Gleanings from the Caves*.

21. Michael Langlois now dates the script of 1QS and 1QSb to 75–50 BCE.

22. Michael Langlois has dated the script of 4QRP[b] to the early Hasmonaean period, not to the late first century BCE as suggested by the editors (DJD 13:201).

4

Overall Response to The Main Papers

Erich S. Gruen

It is a real privilege to have been asked to respond to the major papers stemming from the Nangeroni conference. It is also a real challenge. I have only limited space to offer thoughts on contributions that range widely in topic, approach, and conclusions, and to find connective threads that will allow some coherence to my own contribution. The limits do not, of course, allow for much grappling with detail or arguments with footnotes. I will try to address some interrelated issues that arise in one form or another in most or all of the papers and that speak to the wider concern of our volume.

An overarching theme can certainly be identified: the relationship between what has been called apocalypse and apocalypticism. I am not concerned with terminology or definitions here. I refer to the interaction between ideas, visions, or conceptualizations on the one hand and historical movements on the other; or, put more simply, between text and event. Did the first bring about the other, or vice versa? Did apocalyptic visions inspire action, or did the actions generate apocalyptic interpretations? Or were they quite independent developments? And a related question: did these developments, whether literary or historical, issue from particular levels of society—in other words, were they largely the expressions of the oppressed and the marginalized? And did they arise primarily in special circumstances and conditions, namely crises or catastrophes, whether real or imagined?

These are connected matters, integral to any understanding of apocalyptic ideas or their manifestation. And they emerge in different ways in all of the five contributions that I will address. The papers are, in every case, learned, incisive, and admirable. But respondents are not supposed to be merely admirers lauding the erudition, wisdom, and acuity of the authors. I will be taking a line not exactly critical but questioning, certainly not adverse but perhaps somewhat skeptical and dubious.

The extended "Introduction" by Lester Grabbe is both less and more than an actual introduction to the topic and discussions of the conference. He is, of course, an ideal convener and overseer of such a gathering, since he has labored for many years in this field, and has contributed so much of value to the study of Second

Temple history and literature. Grabbe's introduction does not include a summary or assessment of the papers in this volume. Instead, it addresses the subject of apocalypticism in its own right, offering no bland description of a consensus, but rather an expression of Grabbe's own considered views, some of which take issue with the *communis opinio*, and thus bring an important dimension to the work as a whole.

Terminology has been an elusive and frustrating element in the debate on apocalyptic texts and apocalyptic movements. Grabbe begins with the definition of apocalypse arrived at by the SBL working group in 1979, but adds his own wrinkle and sets discussion on a somewhat different path. As he rightly observes, the embrace of any definition and its application to the texts that we possess runs the risk of circularity. And it will always fit some literary evidence better than others. Where then do we go from here? Grabbe shifts gears slightly and upsets one definitional apple cart. Instead of buying the conventional distinction between apocalyptic and prophecy, he blends them, or rather sets apocalyptic as a subcategory of prophecy. That is a plausible corrective. Too many fuzzy boundaries and overlappings exist between not only prophecy and apocalyptic but mantic writings and mythological worldviews. Grabbe sharply and properly dissolves a number of false dichotomies: e.g. "worldly" and "other-worldly," "this world" and "next world," "history" and "myth," even oral preaching and scribal creation. The field is littered with dichotomous corpses. And Grabbe slays yet one other victim, the widely shared concept that apocalyptic movements arose from the less favored in society, the down-and-outers, the oppressed, and the casualties of society—although this victim had already been wounded by several scholars and succumbed easily to Grabbe's thrusts. On all these matters Grabbe makes a convincing case. The standard divisions are artificial and the categories are confusing. But what substitute can be put in place for this wreckage? The closest that Grabbe comes to one is his assignment of apocalypse to the category of prophecy. I am unsure of how much progress that constitutes. He defines prophecy as a revealed message from a deity. Fair enough, but not especially illuminating. Perhaps it would be better to dispense with categories. Classification and categorization are favorite scholarly pastimes, but they can distract attention from facts on the ground and the evolution of ideas.

In the second part of his introduction Grabbe turns to a survey of Hasmonean history, thereby to set the scene for the apocalyptic writings that occupy most of the papers to follow. Although much of it consists of undisputed narrative, Grabbe does not resort to a simple digest of consensus conclusions. He injects his own interpretations at key points, often at variance with other scholars, and thus provides a genuine contribution of his own.

In particular, Grabbe undermines the notion that a struggle between Hellenism and Judaism lay in the background of the Maccabean uprising. He rightly observes that the introduction by the High Priest Jason of certain Hellenic elements constituted no drastic innovation, nor is there hard evidence that his actions caused any breach in Jewish law. Further, he shows that Menelaus, Jason's successor as High Priest, showed no interest in advancing the cause of Hellenism in Judea.

These points have been made before, and indeed there is growing agreement that Hellenic infiltration did not provide impetus for the Maccabean insurgency, but Grabbe's vigorous intervention on that side is a welcome one. One discordant note, however, does arise in Grabbe's assertion that Jason's "Hellenistic reform" came to an end upon Menelaus's acquisition of the High Priesthood. That appears inconsistent, even at odds with Grabbe's own thesis. If the changes introduced by Jason were largely inoffensive and acceptable, why should Menelaus undo them? And there is no evidence to indicate that he did.

The reasons for Antiochus IV's religious repression of the Jews and his installation of a new cult in the Temple remain intractable. Grabbe exercises some prudence by leaving the matter open. The entrance of Judah Maccabee and his followers onto the scene is comparably mysterious. Grabbe suggests, without elaboration, that they may not have been part of the initial resistance. Why not? The topic is put aside, perhaps also an exercise of prudence. But Grabbe does pronounce on the Maccabees' supposed change of policy: they moved from desire to practice their own religion to the aim of complete independence from Seleucid rule. That judgement can be questioned. Elimination of Hellenic authority was never a realistic possibility. Judah, in fact, was not averse to negotiations with Seleucid commanders and representatives of the crown. And efforts to maintain a modus vivendi with the Hellenistic kingdom become still more conspicuous under Jonathan. Grabbe himself acknowledges that Jonathan's authority had royal backing. This was true even under Simon, whose titles and powers had Seleucid endorsement. The claim that "Judah was now an independent state" needs serious qualification. The Hasmonean state succeeded in large part because it reached understandings with the Seleucids, not because it gained independence from them. Conversely, the coming of Rome made a less dramatic difference than Grabbe allows. Roman overlordship, exercised at some distance through a legate in Syria, was little different from Seleucid. And Judean policy was hardly less self-determined under the Herodians than it had been under the Hasmoneans.

Grabbe's two-part introduction has much to recommend it. The discussion of terminology for apocalyptic and apocalypticism and the dissection of artificial dichotomies, thereby complicating an oversimplified picture, represent an effective opening for this volume. And the survey of Jewish history from Onias III to Herod supplies a useful setting for the individual treatments of apocalyptic perspectives in the subsequent papers. But the two parts are quite distinct. Grabbe refrains from linking any of the events that he identifies as turning points with apocalyptic thinking itself. That is left to others. More's the pity. We would have liked to have his take on that connection.

Anathea Portier-Young addresses a large, difficult, and slippery subject head-on, much to her credit. How does one define a worldview? And, more pointedly, how does one define an apocalyptic worldview? The search for definition has occupied scholars for a very long time, without firm decision or complete consensus. Well over thirty years ago, the SBL even sponsored a project to produce a collective judgement on whether apocalypse constitutes a genre and, if so, how it should

be characterized. But it is unclear that the outcome commanded solid scholarly unanimity. And it would be optimistic to claim that we achieved a consensus in this volume. But Portier-Young's paper offers a salutary start.

What sort of evidence allows us even to grope toward characterization of an apocalyptic worldview in antiquity? Portier-Young very wisely observes that reliance on texts can be misleading and deceptive. They are all we've got, and we can't avoid them. But the natural tendency to equate apocalypses articulated by our sources with an apocalyptic worldview is a hazardous leap. As Portier-Young notes, worldviews do not reside solely in literary texts but gain expression through ritual practices, songs, prayers, visual images, interaction in public and private spaces, conversations and discussions, and oral transmission of ideas, values, and beliefs that make no direct appearance in our written evidence. Once this is acknowledged, however, where do we go from there? How do we get at the testimony that doesn't survive?

Drawing on the research of philosophers, sociologists, anthropologists, psychologists, and theologians would seem to be helpful. One can, as Portier-Young does, generate a checklist of characteristics and functions of worldviews in general. Few would quarrel with her emphasis on social groups as the repository and source for worldviews and the variety of channels whereby those views are transmitted and spread that go well beyond mere textual representations. But how does this checklist allow us to move from the nature of worldviews in general to the nature of *apocalyptic* worldviews? And how does this in turn give us access to *Jewish* apocalyptic worldviews, and then eventually to Jewish apocalyptic worldviews of the Seleucid and Hasmonean periods? The mechanism of moving from one level to another is not spelled out and remains elusive. Portier-Young provides no road map here.

Of course, there are multiple Jewish apocalyptic worldviews, not a monolithic one. And they unquestionably shifted with changing circumstances, with social and political conditions, with heightened awareness of or less intense engagement with contemporary developments. All this seems perfectly reasonable. But tracing these fluctuations is a formidable task. Portier-Young warns that the evidence of the texts may not be the most reliable reflection of attitudes and outlooks. The fact—if it is a fact—that they largely cluster about the period of the Hasmonean resistance to Seleucid oppression and that of the Great Revolt against Rome and its aftermath has naturally given rise to the idea that apocalyptic thinking springs up in crises, a response and reaction to distress, oppression, or failure. But how far is this simply a feature of the survival of texts? Portier-Young reminds us that we cannot assume the disappearance of apocalyptic worldviews in the centuries between Judah Maccabee and the destruction of the Temple. The existence of apocalyptic texts and traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls is enough to complicate the picture and extend the chronology in which such thinking is discernible. There may well have been more continuity than just lurching from crisis to crisis. A fundamental question arises here, as in all the papers that addressed the theme of the conference. As Portier-Young expresses it, can apocalyptic movement and apocalyptic worldview be uncoupled from one another? In other words, can the

latter serve as explanation or motivation for the former? Portier-Young treats the topic gingerly. She is quite right to criticize those who focus solely on the events around the Maccabean rising and the Great Revolt, and the associated apocalyptic writings, as if a crisis were required to bring such texts into being. And she properly dissents from those who identify alienation or dramatic change as principal catalysts for the formation of apocalyptic. She prefers to see apocalyptic worldviews as part of the mainstream of Judaism rather than at its margins.

Apocalyptic thinking does not exhibit itself in apocalypses alone. Various and diverse strands can pop up in unlikely places, even novels. Scholars have found them in the Greek Additions to Daniel and in Tobit, as Portier-Young notes. One might add Joseph and Aseneth, with its heavenly figure and mysterious honeycomb, or the Testament of Abraham, which is more novel with apocalyptical allusions than apocalypse with novelistic elements. It is reasonable enough to posit a whole range of methods and media whereby such ideas could be spread: in synagogues, pilgrimages, markets, public squares, voluntary associations, communal networks, etc. that did not require the writing or reading of texts. One need not resort to epidemiology as a metaphor for the exchange and expansion of ideas, as Portier-Young does. Network theory, which has become increasingly illuminating in ancient studies, as in the work of Irad Malkin, might offer a more useful approach. In any case, the generation of worldviews that reflected apocalyptic thinking does not depend upon upheaval and turmoil in history, nor does it disappear in times of calm and stability. The circulation of worldviews can have a momentum of its own, independent of external cataclysm or even internal anxieties.

Much of this emerges from Portier-Young's thoughtful ruminations on worldviews. But in the end we are still shackled by the limitations of our evidence. We fall back upon the scrutiny and interpretation of texts in order to reconstruct the mindset of those who composed them. That reconstructed mindset leads in turn to the identification of the texts as apocalyptic expressions. And that has led further to the postulation of historical circumstances that called forth the texts—an ever-present risk of circularity. Even Portier-Young brings the "crisis" concept in once more by the back door. She allows that economic and social unrest can produce a significant shift in worldview, as the population finds its former understanding inadequate to the new situation and so seeks new solutions and explanations. In eras of stability and prosperity, by contrast, no urgent need arises for shifts in worldview, and a conservative continuity prevails. Indeed Portier-Young proposes that conditions of empire in the Hellenistic period facilitated the genesis of an apocalyptic worldview. That construct skates perilously close to the same "crisis" analysis that much of her paper undermines. So, we are left to wonder whether we are back to where we started.

Gabriele Boccaccini's very interesting paper also addresses the issue of how far apocalyptic writings represent responses to apocalyptic events, i.e. catastrophic events or crises. That central question runs, whether spoken or unspoken, throughout the volume. Its resolution presents a real challenge. What counts as an apocalyptic event? And what counts as an apocalyptic text? Definitions are

difficult, and are bound to seem arbitrary. Boccaccini does not attempt them. That is understandable, but it renders any conclusions vulnerable.

On the influence of apocalyptic events upon apocalyptic writings, Boccaccini is properly dubious. Matters are more complicated than that. He finds, quite plausibly, that apocalyptic thought, when it arises, has more to do with the internal dynamics of Jewish social groups, their ideological differences, political conflicts, or contention for authority. Indeed, he goes further to a bold conclusion: whereas dissident groups take apocalyptic ideas seriously as expression of resistance or opposition to the ruling class, members of the elite manipulate apocalyptic expectations to further their own ends, usually, it seems, to confirm the status quo.

This is an intriguing concept, and Boccaccini commendably puts it forth for scrutiny. Establishing it, however, is no easy matter. When he applies it to the Hasmonean era, Boccaccini takes an even bolder line. He proposes that the degree of apocalypticism of a text is inversely proportional to its support of the Hasmoneans; in other words, the more a text supports the Hasmonean cause, the less apocalyptic it is. This principle, which, according to Boccaccini, admits of no exceptions, would dispose of the notion that only external crises can provoke apocalyptic thinking. But, paradoxically, it ties apocalypses even more closely to external developments. The very existence of the Hasmonean dynasty, on this interpretation, dictated the production of apocalyptic texts or their absence, as the case may be, depending upon the social circumstances of the writers and their attitudes toward the regime. And those attitudes themselves, in Boccaccini's view, were largely determined by positions in society: marginalized groups went in for apocalypses, the more prosperous elements preferred non-apocalyptic theologies. So, while rightly questioning the common notion that apocalyptic thought stems from crises, he retains the traditional idea that they do express the frustrations of the oppressed or disadvantaged.

How far does this work with regard to the texts that surface in the age of the Seleucids and the Hasmoneans? Boccaccini cites 1 Maccabees, which is certainly a pro-Hasmonean text, and which does not contain apocalypses. None will quarrel with that. But it is hard to prove a negative. Is the absence of an apocalypse due to the fact that the author is sympathetic to the Hasmoneans? Boccaccini points to indirect echoes of apocalyptic themes when the author characterizes Simon's rule as installing an era of peace and prosperity, the wicked and lawless were expelled from the land, young and old enjoyed rapport, the poor were protected, and the temple regained its splendor (1 Macc. 14.4-15). On Boccaccini's analysis, the author of 1 Maccabees was familiar with apocalyptic thinking but turned it to his own ends as a sign of the strength and endurance of the Hasmonean regime. But one wonders whether this needs to be seen as a fulfilled eschatology at all—or indeed that readers would have recognized it as such. This one allusion near the very end of the work hardly characterizes the thrust of 1 Maccabees.

Boccaccini brings the Book of Judith into the reckoning as well. He finds a comparable echo of apocalyptic thought at the very conclusion of the work, which declares that Israel was free of any enemy who could threaten it for the rest of Judith's days and for many days thereafter, thus another fulfilled eschatology

(Jud. 16.25). In Boccaccini's interpretation, this further illustrates employment of an apocalyptic theme in the interests of the ruling regime, the Hasmoneans. The idea, however, rests heavily on the identification of the fictional character Judith with the Hasmonean queen Shlomzion, Salome Alexandra. Boccaccini points to a number of interesting parallels in a recent article he published on the subject. But I doubt that many readers who were inspired by the story and admired Judith would have made a connection to Shlomzion. Judith, after saving Jerusalem by slaying Holofernes and frightening off the invader, retired immediately into an esteemed private life for a very long time thereafter (she lived to the age of 105). Shlomzion, by contrast, had no hand in turning back the invasion of Tigranes, which Boccaccini sees as reflected in the Judith story. Tigranes departed because of a Roman intervention in Armenia, and the brief remainder of Shlomzion's time was consumed in pathetic and unsuccessful efforts to deal with the fierce and sordid contest between her sons for royal power in Judea (Jos. *BJ*, 1.115–119; *Ant*. 13.419–430). It is unlikely that the noble figure of Judith would translate into Shlomzion in the public mind and thus serve as a buttress to the Hasmonean regime.

Boccaccini is on firmer ground with acknowledged apocalyptic texts like the Enochic tradition and the Book of Daniel. They certainly point to a time when divine intervention will put an end to the evil world and the wicked within it in order to bring about a new cosmic order, even though, as Boccaccini rightly notes, the two visions are not identical and very probably represented different groups in different circumstances. But is it fair to say that each in its own way expressed hostility to or at least strong reservations about the Hasmonean dynasty? Daniel certainly and the *Dream Visions* of Enoch almost certainly predate the installation of the Hasmonean dynasty. One can hardly make a case for anti-Hasmonean proclivities on their part.

2 Maccabees seems to fall into something like an intermediary category in Boccaccini's reconstruction. It has more prominent apocalyptic features than 1 Maccabees or Judith but does not deliver any apocalypses like 1 Enoch or Daniel. As for its attitude toward the Hasmoneans, Boccaccini surmises that the author began as a supporter of the Maccabean Revolt, then became disenchanted. It is indeed true that the dramatic martyrdoms recorded in 2 Maccabees and the possibility of resurrection in a future life do have affinities with apocalyptic ideas. But does this suffice to put 2 Maccabees in a category with texts critical of the Hasmoneans? The fact that the work treats only the years of Judah Maccabee hardly means that it is hostile to or disenchanted with the Hasmoneans who followed. Indeed the author concludes his narrative by claiming proudly that from the time of Judah's victory over Nicanor, Jerusalem has remained continuously in the possession of the Hebrews (2 Macc. 15:37). That can only be a declaration of praise for the Hasmoneans. In short, the general rule that Boccaccini provocatively puts forward, that the degree of apocalypticism in these texts discloses the degree to which they lean for or against the Hasmoneans, may not be the best approach.

The same holds for the broader idea that marginalized or powerless groups tend to embrace apocalyptic theologies, while non-apocalyptic narratives issue

from the ruling class. As Boccaccini himself reminds us not only here but in all his work, matters are always more complex than they seem. We lack the evidence that might disclose social and economic unrest and the class conflicts that preceded the Maccabean era. Boccaccini can only speak of them in vague terms. Whether they gave rise to some apocalyptic literature remains beyond our grasp. The presumption that apocalyptic texts must be rooted in contemporary social and political circumstances should not be taken for granted.

The relationship between written apocalypses and actual apocalyptic movements is addressed also in Gerbern Oegema's paper, and is plainly a central concern in the larger discussion on apocalypticism. Oegema points to the critical contribution of Klaus Koch, built upon by the SBL "Genres Project," which, among other things, stressed the distinction between the apocalypse as a literary genre and apocalypticism as a historical movement. The distinction is, of course, a valid one. But how are we to understand the dynamics between them? Is the literary form a mere convention, a self-generating genre, requiring no external stimulus, just as epic poetry might be composed without reference to historical events? Homer, after all, did not require an actual Trojan War to produce the *Iliad*, even though the vividness of his poem virtually transformed the myth into history for countless generations of Greeks. Does it suffice to trace apocalyptic traditions from I Enoch to 4 Ezra as variations on a theme or the evolution of a literary genre rather than authentic expressions driven by events on the ground? Boccaccini and Portier-Young are cautiously skeptical about inferring the latter from the former. Oegema, on the other hand, is more comfortable with finding connections between the two. The social setting that prompted production of apocalypses is a central focus for him. He wisely prefers a multivalent approach. The texts do not reflect simply the cries of the oppressed, the socially and economically deprived classes, the prime victims of oppression or inequality. He recognizes that apocalyptic writings could emerge from a whole range of social contexts and a variety of figures from diverse backgrounds. Oegema offers an interesting taxonomy of different approaches ranging from the literary to the theological to the social-scientific in the first part of his paper. But when he moves from the general to the specific, matters get really interesting.

Oegema bores into the critical example that speaks to the broader issue: was the Maccabean Revolt influenced by apocalypticism? His answer is complex, but also elusive. By affirming that apocalyptic mindsets can be associated with any number of social contexts or combinations thereof rather than simply with the marginalized or powerless, he opens the door to numerous possibilities. Apocalyptic worldviews, on his reckoning, had widespread circulation and appeal in the third and second centuries BCE, independent of any crises. That is plausible enough. The Maccabees may have drawn on a whole matrix of apocalyptic traditions as part of their cultural inheritance rather than a direct prod for their actions or a means of justifying them after the event. The fact that apocalyptic ideas were in the air, that texts like 1 Enoch, Daniel, the *Third Sibylline Oracle,* and the *Assumption of Moses* were circulating, that they represented attitudes percolating

among Jewish communities—all this supplies an appropriate setting for those who may have led, joined, or sympathized with the Maccabean movement. As reconstruction of the framework or part of the framework within which that movement emerged, Oegema's analysis sheds light upon it. But I am not sure that one can go much beyond that general statement.

Oegema, however, does wish to go beyond it. He maintains that the apocalyptic worldview is more central to the Maccabean uprising than is usually thought. But how do we know? Oegema strives to find closer ties between the texts produced in this period and the ideology of the Maccabees. Here we are on slippery turf. He squeezes what he can out of the First and Second Books of Maccabees. But there is not much there for his purpose. Not a whiff of apocalypticism exists in 1 Maccabees. And little or nothing even in 2 Maccabees, apart from allusion to eternal life for the mother and her seven sons martyred in the persecutions (2 Macc. 23, 29, 34–36)—which is not exactly an apocalypse.

As is notorious, most scholars take I Enoch 90, the *Animal Apocalypse*, as alluding to the period prior to the Maccabean Revolt and to Judah Maccabee and the revolt itself. If so, this would indeed constitute a direct connection between an apocalyptic text and historical events. This is not the place to debate the proposed identifications of the various predatory birds who plucked out the eyes of the sheep and then joined with dogs to devour them down to the bone, or the horns that sprouted on the lambs and the great horn that sprouted on the ram, usually seen as Judah Maccabee (I Enoch 90.2-19). The inference that portions of the apocalypse were composed precisely between 165 and 160 depends on that identification, whose merits cannot be discussed here, for it would take us too far afield. Oegema in any case accepts the direct relevance of I Enoch 90 to the upheavals of the second century and finds the assaults of ravens and other vicious birds upon the hapless sheep and lambs as reflection of Ptolemaic and Seleucid oppression of the Jews, who were surrounded by their enemies until the emergence of the Maccabean resistance. He goes on to maintain that the authors of I Enoch 90 embraced Judah Macccabee as one of their own and interpreted his movement as the outgrowth of their own apocalyptic ideas, thus a "realized eschatology." On this reckoning, the text may indeed be, as he puts it, "a very close and authentic reflection on the events."

But is it? We should note that if the ferocious struggle of predatory birds and their victims, the sheep and lambs, does allude to the cruel oppression of the Jews by Ptolemies and Seleucids, that does not easily reflect the reality as we know it. Our evidence shows little sign of Ptolemaic coercive suppression of Jews in Palestine in the third century. Of course, the Ptolemies exercised an overlordship in the region, and Jews, like others, paid taxes to the crown. But, as the evidence of the Zeno papyri shows, and the fictional tales of the Tobiads reinforces, local Jewish officialdom played a significant part in political and economic administration. And a Jewish High Priest remained the central figure in the realm, without Ptolemaic generals or governors breathing down his neck. We know that Jews prospered in Egypt, the heartland of Ptolemaic rule, established their own synagogues, served in the military, had occupations as merchants, shippers,

traders, and artisans, even held some form of civic status, and plainly did not suffer harsh subjugation. If they could enjoy such success in Egypt, they were surely not crushed by Ptolemaic power in their homeland.

Nor did things change much when Seleucids established their dominion at the beginning of the second century BCE. Yes, taxation from Judea would now be part of the regular revenues for Antioch. Yes, a Seleucid garrison replaced the Ptolemaic one in the Akra. And the king could appoint royal officials to insure orderly administration of the shrines in the region, as the recently discovered Heliodorus inscription establishes. But the crown did not rule with a heavy hand. Antiochus III's so-called "charter for the Jews," documents preserved by Josephus, included tax relief, subsidies for construction, support for sacrifices, and a guarantee that Jews can live under their own ancestral laws. These benefactions were reinforced by another document of Antiochus III, recorded by an inscription from Bet Shean, protecting Jewish villages from unlawful billeting of soldiers, and violation of other rights. Antiochus III's successor, Seleucus IV, pursued comparable policies. As 2 Maccabees tells us, he footed the bill for sacrificial worship in the Temple (2 Macc. 3.2–3). And the Jewish High Priest continued to be head of state. Seleucid suzerainty, like that of the Ptolemies before them, was fundamentally a negotiated reciprocity between the crown and local governance, not the iron rule of tyrannical oppression. It is important to stress what is often overlooked, that the policies of Antiochus IV Epiphanes were a dramatic anomaly, not a continuation of what had been standard Ptolemaic and Seleucid behavior.

In view of this, it might be prudent to wonder whether this apocalypse, 1 Enoch 90, was indeed a "very close and authentic reflection on the events." It may have more to do with the vision of a particular sect than with actual historical occurrences.

One might say the same also of the *Third Sibylline Oracle*, cited in this connection by Oegema as another apocalyptic text with direct historical reference, a "realized eschatology" for Egyptian Jews in the reign of Ptolemy VI or VII. The three separate and isolated references in the Third Sibyl to a "seventh king" and the allusion to "the king from the sun," each in a very different context, make no mention of Ptolemies (who are not normally identified by numbers), have no bearing on events in those reigns, and are set in eschatological, not historical, contexts. The assertion that the verses must have been composed between 163 and 145 rests on shaky foundations.

We are, of course, on safer ground with the Book of Daniel. The author's grasp of history is firmer and his historical references more explicit. The sequence of kingdoms represented by the metals in Nebuchadnezzar's dream in Daniel 2 and the succession of beasts in Daniel 7 plainly refer to great empires replacing one another, culminating in the mighty but failed effort by the hybristic king to thwart the will of the Most High. Few can doubt that this points to Antiochus IV and his assault upon Jewish religion, tradition, and the Temple. And Daniel 11, in fact, gives a remarkably well informed summary of Hellenistic history from Alexander through the struggles of the diadochoi, the sequence of wars between Ptolemies and Seleucids, even marital diplomacy between the royal houses, the

double invasion of Egypt by Antiochus IV, his rebuff at the hands of the Romans, and the attack on the Temple. But where is the Maccabean Revolt in all this? The author, who has been reasonably precise up until now, speaks only about the violators of the covenant on the one hand, and those who know their God and stand firm on the other, with the *maskilim* as their leaders and advisors, but to no avail, since they fall victim to the oppressor—and they receive little help. If that last allusion is to the Maccabees, as many believe, it can hardly be seen as an endorsement of their actions, since they provided virtually no assistance to the victims. It is unclear indeed that the author of Daniel knew anything at all about the Maccabees, let alone that he was an advocate of theirs. Daniel's apocalyptic visions about the fall of the final earthly kingdom at the hand of God has no direct or obvious connection to the Maccabean uprising. Nor can one infer anything about the influence of such visions upon Judah Maccabee and his followers. The apocalypses of Daniel 2 and 7 have God Himself terminate the final earthly kingdom and bring about the eschaton. He has no need of human assistance.

Oegema's effort to establish a context of apocalyptic thinking to illuminate the circumstances of the Maccabean movement is a worthy one. But one can raise doubts about the endeavor in general. The absence of direct reference to Judah, his supporters, or his aims in any of these texts, including one other mentioned by Oegema, the *Assumption of Moses*, whose date is quite uncertain and allusions obscure, should at least give us pause. That apocalyptic visions were discussed in some Jewish circles in the second century BCE seems clear enough. But it goes too far to infer that the Maccabean Revolt arose from groups that propagated these visions or that it owed its ideology to an apocalyptic worldview expressed in those texts. The larger question addressed here remains unresolved: what are the links, if any, between the surviving apocalyptic texts and historical movements? Did the texts inspire the movements, support them, comment on them, or reflect upon them after the fact? On the evidence of the works considered here by Oegema, in what would seem to be the most likely laboratory for drawing a conclusion, the Maccabean uprising, the verdict has to be one of suspended judgement. For those who await the eschaton, earthly events may not be of paramount importance.

Kenneth Atkinson, too, suggests that an important interconnection exists between apocalyptic thought and historical circumstances. He trains his focus on the clash of sectarian groups in the Hasmonean era and the impact of apocalyptic expectations upon those who opposed the regime in the expectation of the end time. The close association between apocalyptic ideas and developments on the ground forms a central tenet for his discussion.

Atkinson's well-researched and carefully argued paper does not confine itself to making this case in the abstract but seizes upon a particular episode to give it some welcome concreteness. His case study is the invasion of Hasmonean territory by Demetrius III of Syria in the reign of Alexander Jannaeus, the narrative of which we possess in Josephus, both in the *War* and in the *Antiquities*. The historian supplies a puzzling account in which Jannaeus cruelly repressed Jewish dissidents in his realm who then proceeded to revolt at the time of a festival, possibly that

of Tabernacles. The Hasmonean ruler consequently intensified his repression, slaying six thousand Jews who had opposed him. Then, after the loss of a major battle with the Nabatean Arabs, from which he barely escaped alive, and further sedition at home, Jannaeus conducted a massacre of fellow Jews, killing a total of fifty thousand (if Josephus's figures are to be believed) over a six-year period. His remaining enemies in the homeland now turned to Demetrius, encouraged him to invade and joined his cause. The Seleucid king gained a clear victory, but with a surprising consequence: the Jews who fought on the Syrian side suddenly found compassion for Jannaeus and reversed allegiance once again, thus causing Demetrius to withdraw and abandon the contest. Jannaeus emerged successful, but reconciliation with his present and former enemies among the Jews was never, it seems, even considered. He resumed the slaughter of his own people, ordering eight hundred of them crucified, while he executed their wives and children before their eyes (Jos. *BJ*, 1.88–98; *Ant*. 13.372–381).

Such is the story. Atkinson rightly points to its various implausibilities, particularly with regard to the fluctuating behavior of both Demetrius and the Jewish warriors. He may well be correct in arguing for a slightly different chronology that has Demetrius plan his war on Jannaeus for two years before implementing it, without requiring any impetus from the Jewish enemies of the Hasmonean, and in explaining Demetrius's withdrawal from the field by internal struggles over the Seleucid succession, rather than by inexplicable reversal of form on the part of Jewish soldiers. Atkinson's reconstruction makes more sense than Josephus's tortured narrative. But we are left to wonder how it was that Josephus got it so wrong. What interest would he have in concocting a double *volte-face* on the part of Jannaeus's Jewish foes? Atkinson does not propose an answer to that puzzle.

Which sectarian group constituted the principal internal opposition to Jannaeus? In Atkinson's view, the Pharisees were the likeliest culprits, a conclusion reached through some very indirect testimony drawn from the Mishnah, the Nahum Pesher, and the Hosea Pesher. That conclusion, in principle, is not implausible. But it lacks explicit attestation. And why did Josephus refrain from naming the Pharisees in the course of his narrative regarding Jewish shifts of allegiance during the campaigns of Demetrius III? He had certainly not hesitated to name them in his discussions of John Hyrcanus's reign, the end of Jannaeus's, and that of his widow Alexandra.

Where do apocalyptic texts come into play here? Atkinson's learned and complicated argument on this point defies ready recapitulation. It depends largely on a Qumran text, 4Q390, and the interpretation offered by Hanan Eshel, our late and much lamented colleague, whom Atkinson duly cites and credits. As is well known, the prophecy of Jeremiah that exile would last for seventy years is revised by Daniel, 9.24-27, who interprets it as seventy weeks of years, i.e. four hundred and ninety years, after which transgressions will cease, sins will be terminated, iniquities expiated, everlasting righteousness installed, and the Temple anointed, a genuinely eschatological vision. Daniel, writing at the time of Antiochus IV's desecration of the Temple, looked ahead, it appears, to a period of restoration and rededication. The Dead Sea Scroll, 4Q390, in Eshel's interpretation, constituted

a revision of Daniel's prophecy, a sharp critique of the priestly class of his own era, who will suffer dire punishments at the hands of their enemies, and will contend fiercely with one another for seventy years. For Eshel, the seventy years constitute the extent of Hasmonean rule, presumably to be terminated by the final redemption. Depending on how one calculates it, this brings the projected eschaton very close to the time of the clash between Alexander Jannaeus and his seditious countrymen.

Atkinson builds on this reconstruction and on a suggestion by Al Baumgarten to interpret 4Q390 as a call to overthrow the Hasmonean control of the priesthood and monarchy, which would help to account for the hostility of so many of Jannaeus's contemporaries to his rule. On that theory, the ferocious resistance to Jannaeus stemmed from the conviction that a prophetic text neared fulfillment at the time of Demetrius's invasion and that it heralded the end of the Hasmonean dynasty.

This is a most elaborate hypothesis, attractive and appealing but highly speculative. It converts Josephus's narrative of Jannaeus's Jewish foes moving back and forth between Hasmonean and Seleucid leaders into one in which a determined faction, the Pharisees, held strong apocalyptic convictions and used them to strengthen their will against Jannaeus himself. And it requires that the author of 4Q390 transform the prophecy of Daniel into a vehicle of propaganda, which, despite its obscurity, unraveled only by perceptive modern scholars, would nevertheless be intelligible to Jewish military rank and file. I cannot rule out this possibility. But the combination of conjectures that it demands should make us uneasy. It hardly constitutes an ideal instance to illustrate the proposition that apocalyptic ideology helped to inspire historical events. That proposition remains unestablished.

To conclude. These remarks express some skepticism about standard presumptions that apocalyptic writings arise from particular historical circumstances and particular social groups or that they provoked or influenced historical events and developments. This is not for a moment to diminish the quality, acuity, and often ingenuity of the papers discussed. There is much to be learned from each of them. But I hope to have made a case for caution and hesitancy in embracing the idea of a close connection between text and event when our information is so limited and when the events have to be either imposed on the texts or inferred very indirectly from them.

One ought not to conclude from this that apocalyptic writings are mere literary conventions, passed on from generation to generation, modified or recast solely in accord with intellectual fashion, with no link to historical circumstances. It is, however, worth considering the proposition that apocalyptic thought has a life of its own and a momentum of its own as part of a people's culture and traditions, independent of particular groups or of particular historical contexts. This in no way diminishes the significance of apocalyptic literature and worldviews. If anything, it accords them still greater stature and greater importance.

Part III

Short Papers

SESSION 1

1

The Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls and the Historical Development of Jewish Apocalyptic Literature

Daniel A. Machiela

Over the past decade there has been an uptick in attention devoted to the Aramaic literature from the Qumran caves, as seen most notably in the *Aramaica Qumranica* conference dedicated to these texts at Aix-en-Provence in 2008 (Berthelot and Stökl 2010). Among the topics prominently addressed during this time has been the apocalyptic outlook of the Aramaic Scrolls, a trait that comprises one distinctive inflection of this literature when viewed as a group. Florentino García Martínez (2010: 438) has rightly observed that a "disproportionately large number" of these texts have an "apocalyptic character" when compared with other textual clusters from the Second Temple period. Yet, despite their remarkably strong apocalyptic outlook, the Aramaic Scrolls have only just begun to be fit into our descriptions of the apocalyptic literary genre and apocalypticism in Hellenistic period Judaism. This paper is an effort to foster further discussion along these lines. My approach here is quite broad, seeking to outline a general framework for the place and development of apocalypses and apocalypticism in the Aramaic texts, meaning that I have had little space for detailed discussion of individual compositions. Such discussion is surely warranted in the future.

Before beginning in earnest, it is necessary to specify those texts that I consider either to be apocalypses, or to contain noteworthy apocalyptic characteristics. Determining such a list is fraught with languishing debates and unavoidable judgement calls deserving of far more discussion than can be given here. This, however, must await another venue, and here I simply list the texts considered:

> *1 Enoch* 13:8–36:4 (*The Book of Watchers*: Enoch's first heavenly ascent); *Book of Giants* (the dream visions of the giants); *1 Enoch* 72–82 (*The Astronomical Book*); *1 Enoch* 83–84 (*The Dream Visions* I: The earth's destruction by the

flood);[1] *1 Enoch* 85–90 (*The Dream Visions II: The Animal Apocalypse*), *1 Enoch* 93:1–10; 91:11–17 (*Apocalypse of Weeks*); *1 Enoch* 106–107 (*Birth of Noah*); *Genesis Apocryphon* (1Q20) 2–5.27; *Birth of Noah* (4Q534–36); Daniel 2; *Four Kingdoms* (4Q552–53); Daniel 7; *Son of God* (or *Apocryphon of Daniel*; 4Q246); *Pseudo-Daniel A* (4Q243–44); *Pseudo-Daniel B* (4Q245); *Genesis Apocryphon* 12.26(?)–15; *Genesis Apocryphon* 6.11–7.6; *Testament of Jacob* (4Q537); *Aramaic Levi Document* (1QLevi, 4Q213a, 4Q213b); *Apocryphon of Levi* (4Q540–41); *Visions of Amram* (4Q543–47); *Words of Michael* (4Q529, 4Q571); *New Jerusalem* (1Q32, 2Q24, 4Q554, 554a, 555, 5Q15, 11Q18); Four other visionary texts (4Q556, 556a, 557, 558); 4QpapApocalypse (4Q489);[2] and 6QApocalypse (6Q14).

Based on the works listed above, the following four observations may be made:

1. The Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls have significantly increased the number of apocalypses or distinctively apocalyptic texts available to us before their discovery—we find somewhere between fourteen and twenty new apocalypses or apocalyptically oriented compositions in all. Unfortunately, some of these are too fragmentary to be of great help in detailed discussions, but the general point should not be undersold: the compositions of apocalypses and apocalyptic texts was thriving during the Hellenistic period to an extent that we can much better appreciate since the scrolls were discovered, and for the most part this burst of creativity is witnessed among the Aramaic texts from Qumran. It is highly probable that a number of other apocalyptic works were not preserved for us, and that the number of such texts was once much higher than the thirty compositions, or major literary sub-units, listed above.

2. The known apocalyptic works from the Hellenistic period can now be said to have been written overwhelmingly in Aramaic. It would not be an overstatement to say that until the Hasmonean period, Aramaic was the language of apocalyptic literature. Of course, we possess Daniel 8–12, perhaps *Jubilees* (though this strikes me as a somewhat different type of text), and a few other Hebrew texts from Qumran that have been proposed as apocalypses or distinctively apocalyptic

1. The presence of this section of 1 Enoch among the Qumran manuscripts has been debated. G. W. E. Nickelsburg (*1 Enoch 1* [Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001], 24, 352–3) finds no evidence of these chapters, and suggests that they may have been a late addition. However, L. T. Stuckenbruck (*1 Enoch 91-108* [CEJL; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007], 11 n.31) notes that two fragments from a manuscript of the Book of Giants (4QEnGiants[a] [= 4Q204] 9–10) contain text that resembles 1 En. 84:2-4, and may be a version of the first dream vision.

2. The very fragmentary 4Q489 contains too little text to determine a genre or narrative context. It does speak of "seeing" in visionary language, and may have been an apocalypse or contained apocalyptic elements, but no more may be said. Similarly ambiguous is 6QApocalypse (6Q14). Neither text can be used with any confidence for study of our topic.

works (e.g. 4Q248, 4Q383-90, 4Q410).[3] On the whole, however, scholars such as Stegemann (1983), Dimant (1994, 2007), Stone (2011), García Martínez (2010), Frey (2007), and Collins (2010) have accurately observed the rather surprising dearth of Hebrew literature in this vein, most notably among the Dead Sea Scrolls.

The reason for the close correspondence between Aramaic and early apocalyptic literature is in need of further study, and potentially bears on our historical situation of the corpus in general. This question leads us into the important, larger topic of the Jewish use of Aramaic and Hebrew in the Hellenistic and Roman periods, on which two main lines of thought may be discerned in previous scholarship, at times focused specifically on the bilingual (Aramaic–Hebrew) composition of Daniel. The following overview is, by necessity, oversimplified and does not do justice to any one of the views. It may, however, provide a useful heuristic lens for broad exploration of the topic.

The first type of explanation may be characterized as historical, which is not to say that it does not allow for some measure of ideology behind the use of one language or another (as is often the case in a bilingual or multilingual situation). Yet, on this view Aramaic was not chosen by the author to make a significant point or statement; it was simply a natural choice for writing literature during the Hellenistic era. It was a prestigious, international language (still the *lingua franca* in this part of the world) which would be understood by a wide range of people, including, but perhaps not limited to, a wide range of Jews. Alternatively, the choice of Aramaic was made more intentionally on ideological grounds in order to make a specific point, or to grant a writing special authority. For example, Devorah Dimant (2007) suggests that Aramaic may have been chosen because it was perceived as the language of hoary antiquity, which would have been used by the patriarchs. It was thus not only fitting for the heavy emphasis on the pre-Mosaic patriarchs in the Aramaic Scrolls, but gave those writings a ring of authenticity that would not have been achieved with Hebrew.

These two approaches share some middle ground, though they place different levels of emphasis on the intentionality behind the choice of Aramaic: in the first it is largely a default language for composition of literature among some Jewish groups until the more ideologically driven move toward Hebrew was adopted and took over (e.g. in *Jubilees*, 1 Maccabees, the translation of Tobit into Hebrew, and the Sectarian Qumran literature), while in the second approach both languages were equally available and were chosen based on ideology throughout the Hellenistic period. After extended reflection on this question, I harbor some serious reservations about the ideological explanations for the use of Aramaic currently on offer. While each proposal may explain part of the data, it does not fit more widely with *all* of the evidence of the Aramaic Scrolls. If Aramaic is meant to accord with the antiquity of the patriarchs and lend the writing an authentic feel, why are the *Words of Michael* and the many Jewish Persian court stories (e.g. Daniel, Tobit, or *Jews in the Persian Court*) written in that language?

3. Hartmut Stegemann (1983) further suggested that *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* may be an apocalypse, but this has not been widely accepted.

At present, a historical explanation that sees an ideological shift toward Hebrew during the Hasmonean period among groups that had been previously writing in Aramaic best accounts for the evidence, and is in my opinion preferable. Before the Hasmonean period, Aramaic was the natural language for *belles lettres* among at least some Jewish scribal groups, who surely received formal training in that language in the hierocratic and/or governmental spheres. In the case of Daniel, the shift to Hebrew is represented by the language switch in Daniel 8, and indicates that Chapter 7 belongs to an earlier, pre-Antiochene/Hasmonean era (in agreement with a large contingent of continental European scholarship). Apart from the introductory section of the book (which formed a large-scale Hebrew *inclusio* structure), the Hasmonean period redactor(s)/author(s) did not see a pressing need to translate this earlier Aramaic material. If the essentials of this view are judged to be correct, then it follows that most of the Aramaic texts belong in the pre-Hasmonean period, even if these texts continued to be copied in the following century, and a few texts continued to be composed in Aramaic during a period of transition between languages (see below).

3. Most of the Aramaic Scrolls are very difficult to date on literary grounds, but a general consensus has emerged among experts that the earlier Aramaic works, such as parts of 1 Enoch (the *Book of Watchers* and the *Astronomical Book*), the court tales of Daniel, the *Aramaic Levi Document*, Tobit, the *Visions of Amram*, and perhaps the *Book of Giants* were composed in the third or early second centuries BCE. I would also place the *Genesis Apocryphon*, *Four Kingdoms*, *Test. Jacob*, *Test. Qahat*, and *Words of Michael* within this time frame. Our latest text with a relatively certain historical referent is *Pseudo-Daniel B* (4Q245), which mentions Simon the Hasmonean (reigned 142–135 BCE) at the end of a list of high priests, and should therefore probably be dated to the 130s in its current form (recognizing that names could have been be added to lists in earlier works as they were copied). The proposed mention of John Hyrcanus in 4Q339 is speculative and uncertain. Despite the occasional suggestion that this or that Aramaic text belongs in the first century BCE (e.g. Fitzmyer of the *Genesis Apocryphon* [2004: 26–37]), the most plausible working hypothesis is that the majority were written during the third and second centuries BCE. This means that a considerable portion of Jewish Aramaic literature, and along with it a number of Jewish apocalyptic texts, were written in the Ptolemaic period or earlier.

4. A notable trait is the extent to which exalted or especially righteous human figures act in roles analogous to the intermediary angel in Collins's *Semeia* 14 definition of an apocalypse. There is Daniel in Daniel 2 and perhaps the *Son of God* text (4Q246), Enoch in the *Birth of Noah* and *Book of Giants*, and Mahalalel in Enoch's first dream vision. In the *Apocalypse of Weeks*, *Animal Apocalypse*, and *Words of Michael* there is no intermediary. In *Four Kingdoms* the dreamer interacts directly with the symbols of the dream, the talking trees. In light of this, I wonder if the angelic intermediary part of Collins's definition would benefit from reconsideration and nuancing. Whatever the case, we can feel here the murky

border separating what Collins would call a non-apocalyptic dream-vision (such as Dan. 2) and an apocalypse.

The apocalyptic sections of the Aramaic Scrolls generally seek to reveal privileged, divine knowledge and wisdom—the mysteries (רזין)—to the reader, vicariously placing her or him in close contact with the heavenly realm. Here the combination of apocalyptic material, pseudepigraphy, and the recording of apocalyptic revelation in writing (two other prominent features of these texts) must be stressed, for they work in tandem to allow readers and hearers to glimpse a divine reality which supersedes and helps make sense of apparent present earthly realities. A strong typological connection between the wicked generation preceding the flood and a later (i.e. the present?) generation is operative in a number of the Aramaic texts, especially those related to Enoch and Noah (the *Book of Watchers*, *Dream Visions*, *Apocalypse of Weeks*, *Book of Giants*, *Birth of Noah*, and *Genesis Apocryphon*). A central message here is that divine judgement will fall on a present or near-future wicked generation in much the way it did with the flood, though some traditions specify that this time it would be associated with fire rather than water. Just as Noah, who is described in a quasi-divine way reminiscent of Daniel's Ancient of Days and/or Son of Man in *Genesis Apocryphon* 2–5 and 1 Enoch 106–107, saved righteous humanity in his generation, so will an exalted figure be involved in the coming judgement. The function of this motif is both to comfort the audience ("the wicked *will* be punished, just as Noah's generation was") and to exhort it ("be on the side of the righteous!"). This complements nicely the dualistic, "two ways" metaphor stressed so vigorously in a preponderance of the Aramaic texts (e.g. 1 Enoch, *Genesis Apocryphon*, *Aramaic Levi*, *Visions of Amram*, *Test. Qahat*, Tobit, *Son of God*). Although the "impending judgement" apocalypses do not fit comfortably into Collins's "heavenly journey" and "historical" categories, we would presumably include them in the latter, since they focus more narrowly on one motif usually found in the more full-blown historical apocalypses such as *Genesis Apocryphon* 13–15, Daniel 7, and the *Apocalypse of Weeks*.

The common apocalyptic themes of God's firm and awesome control over the cosmos and human history are stressed at many places in the Aramaic apocalyptic texts, which Portier-Young (2011) has elegantly shown undermines the audacious claims of earthly rulers and their apparently limitless capacity to impose their wills. Looking beyond these seemingly incontestable earthly powers and the proliferation of wickedness, the reader sees a new kingdom in which righteousness flourishes and all is put right. *The New Jerusalem* text presumably elaborates on this apocalyptic theme.

A function of apocalyptic revelation that has received relatively little attention, but is prominent in the Aramaic Scrolls and significant for assessing the history of apocalyptic literature in the Hellenistic period, is the legitimization of the levitical priesthood through apocalypses of the "heavenly journey" (or "message") type. This is seen especially in the suite of compositions dealing with Jacob, Levi, and Amram (I suspect Qahat would be included here as well, were more of its text preserved). In each of these works a special stress is placed upon the

revealed election of the priesthood in the line of these patriarchs, who bear a special burden for maintaining righteousness, knowledge, and wisdom, and for transmitting these to Israel through subsequent generations. In other texts (e.g. the *Genesis Apocryphon*, followed by *Jubilees*) these priestly traits are mapped back onto earlier figures like Noah. The *Testament of Jacob* (4Q537) combines the priestly and historical aspects of apocalyptic revelation, which may be augmented by the *New Jerusalem* text if it is also attributable to Jacob (as Tigchelaar [2008] suggests).

1. Synthesis and historical situation

The observations made above indicate the potential significance of the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls for contextualizing and deepening our understanding of the historical development of apocalyptic literature and the genre apocalypse. However, the texts contain almost no straightforward historical indicators as to their date of composition, and so our historical constructions of their development must be based mainly on situating inferences and presuppositions into their most plausible historical and social settings, working with our limited knowledge of the period. So far as we can tell, beginning in the Ptolemaic period (or perhaps slightly earlier) Jewish apocalyptic texts began to be produced, exhibiting very close links to the broader category of dream visions. In fact, these are sometimes difficult to distinguish, which is not surprising given the fact that both serve the common purpose of putting the reader in touch with a supra-terrestrial, divine reality that reveals the true state of things (in contrast to human perception). One such difficult, borderline case is Daniel 2; even if some judge it not to be an apocalypse on formal grounds, it is full of apocalyptic traits and must be considered in close connection to Daniel 7 and other historical apocalypses.

The related Jacob-Levi-Amram-Qahat suite of works (which, with Milik and Drawnel, I see as closely related) strongly suggests that the groups responsible for the early Aramaic apocalyptic texts were priests, yet there are no overt indications of a sectarian or splinter-group mentality. The priestly instruction and rhetoric is quite general, though a very strong position is advanced regarding the strict demands of a righteous life. Moreover, the general tone of the Aramaic texts as a group—including those advocating an apocalyptic worldview—is more open to foreigners and foreign contexts than we might have expected. In a surprising number of these texts, Israelites or their ancestors interact with and assist the highest levels of the current foreign government (*Genesis Apocryphon*, Daniel, Tobit, *Jews in the Persian Court*, and *Prayer of Nabonidus*; a loose analogy might be found in Enoch's assistance for the Watchers and giants with their petition in the *Book of Watchers* and *Book of Giants*). At the same time, a constant, unflinching emphasis is placed on the continued piety of Israelites (or their ancestors) in that fraught situation; they do *not* assimilate or compromise their national-religious heritage in the face of such interaction (see e.g. *Test. Qahat* 1 i). On the contrary, they are ultimately rewarded for their fidelity, typically forcing the foreigner

to admit the power of the Most High God (to use a favorite appellation of the Aramaic Scrolls). Given the entertaining and moral tone of many of these Aramaic works, I find it likely that the stories were written by priests in their capacity as Israel's teachers (cf. Lev. 10:11; Deut. 24:8, 33:10), as hortatory models of how it was possible to balance the tensions of foreign domination on one hand and national-religious fidelity on the other. Such a position of measured integration coheres best with a time before Antiochus IV and the Hasmonean uprising. If we adopt the earlier Hellenistic period as a fitting context for a message advocating the carefully considered balance of deference and staunch conservatism (which I do), then we may tentatively suggest a somewhat elastic time frame of the fourth to early second centuries BCE for the *floruit* of Jewish Aramaic literature, with some Aramaic texts continuing to be composed and edited up to the early Hasmonean era (mid-second century). Over this period a group or groups of Jewish priest-scribes wrote in Aramaic because it was the international language of *belles lettres*, was widely understood by the Jewish populace, and was what they were trained in professionally. These authors seem to have known Hebrew perfectly well, judging by their heavy dependence on the Hebrew ancestral books and their occasional recourse to Hebrew words and word-plays when it suited their purpose. Around the Hasmonean period, however, Hebrew began to grow in favor, likely for nationalistic and religious reasons, and the practice that some circles had of composing texts in Aramaic died out. In some cases, Aramaic texts were even translated into Hebrew, such as with Daniel 1, Tobit, and probably 1Q19. So far as we can tell at present, much of the *type* of literature found in the Aramaic Scrolls also waned around this time. *Jubilees* may be seen in part as an impressive summation, adaptation, and integration of parts of the earlier Aramaic tradition into a new, Hebrew framework.

But why all of the apocalypses and apocalyptic material in texts predating the direct, terrorizing threat and reality of religious and ethnic persecution during the reign of Antiochus IV? We have seen (and it has already been recognized by others) that a good deal of apocalyptic literature does not have to do with an urgent specification of when the judgement of a wicked empire would take place, as we find in the last chapters of Daniel. Rather, it addresses basic concerns that are easily understood in the face of the unwanted foreign domination of the early Hellenistic period. This surely included the feeling of complete helplessness that must have accompanied the Syrian wars of the third century, in which Palestine swung back and forth between the hugely impressive war machines of the Ptolemies and Seleucids. There was also the growing influence of Hellenistic culture ("Hellenism") famously described by Martin Hengel. In response to these potentially disturbing and unwished-for events, the teaching priests of Israel used pseudepigraphic apocalyptic revelations to convey messages of assurance and moral paraenesis: the Most High God is firmly in control of creation and history, the wicked *will* be judged and the righteous vindicated, a glorious future awaits those who remain holy, and Israel (especially the priesthood) are still chosen by God and charged with walking in the righteous paths laid out by Him. To be sure, we do see a special Hasmonean-period adaptation of apocalyptic revelation in the

increasingly specific and urgent Hebrew chapters of Daniel (8–12), or the *Animal Apocalypse* and *Apocalypse of Weeks* in 1 Enoch, but these should be seen as new extensions from the already well-established Aramaic tradition.

Related to this last point, the evidence of the Aramaic Scrolls renders the frequently repeated view that the genre of historical apocalypse was born out of the Antiochene atrocities unlikely, or at least in need of further study. In addition to the texts often used to support this view—Daniel 7, the *Animal Apocalypse*, and the *Apocalypse of Weeks*—others texts that may be categorized in whole or in part as historical apocalypses (depending upon the strictness of one's definition) are Daniel 2, *Four Kingdoms*, *Son of God*, *Genesis Apocryphon* 13–15, *Apocryphon of Levi*, *Testament of Jacob*, *Pseudo Daniel A* and *B*, *New Jerusalem*, and 4Q558. Other apocalyptic texts that incorporate historical elements are the *Words of Michael*, *Book of Giants*, Enoch's first dream vision (1 En. 83-84), *Birth of Noah*, and *Visions of Amram*. I find it very unlikely that all of these date to the time of the Antiochene persecution and Hasmonean uprising (though a few surely do), and consider it more plausible that historical apocalyptic texts, with their basic message of divine sovereignty over history and earthly rulers, were already being written in the early Hellenistic period.[4] I do agree, however, that the historical apocalyptic texts developed in new ways in the mid-second century BCE, felt especially in their sharpened chronological specificity and rhetoric.

To conclude, the Aramaic Scrolls provide a rich, understudied resource for the historical situation and development of apocalypses and apocalyptic literature. Aramaic language, a prominent admixture of apocalyptic revelation through dream visions, and an openness to foreigners are a few of the features that set at least some of these texts apart as a related cluster, and suggest that they deserve to be studied further together. If previously proposed dates are correct, a preponderance of the Aramaic literature belongs to the early Hellenistic period, preceding the persecutions of Antiochus IV. Consequently, much of the development of apocalyptic literature, including the historical apocalyptic genre, also took place before this time, as one part of a broader literary effort to foster hope, communal identity, and faithfulness to ancestral traditions among the Jewish populace in the face of an astonishingly powerful foreign empire. If we are to look for the major early stages and impetuses of growth for a Jewish apocalyptic worldview, we should look at the late Persian and Ptolemaic periods, rather than the time of Seleucid rule and Jewish revolt. While the latter period saw the historical apocalypse develop in significant ways, especially as a result of Antiochus IV's actions, the former, much longer era is of great importance for understanding the development of Jewish apocalyptic literature and apocalypticism.

4. In this connection I think that the widely dismissed or overlooked arguments of J. Carmignac (1979), that apocalyptic developed from and were closely related to the dream-vision literature, merits ongoing consideration. This opinion has now, however, received some support from Frances Flannery-Dailey (2004).

Addendum: Previous Lists of Apocalypses and Apocalyptically-oriented Texts among the Aramaic Scrolls

Key:
Discussed by all five authors
Discussed by two or more authors, but not all five
Discussed by this author only
** (A work not known in this form before the Qumran discoveries)*

Dimant[1]	**Frey**[2]	**García Martínez**[3]	**DiTommaso**[4]	**Collins**[5]
"Related to the apocalyptic literature"	"Apocalypsen"	"Apocalyptic character"	"Apocalyptica"	1. "Apocalypses" 2. "Apocalyptic features"
*Book of Giants**	*Daniel*	***New Jerusalem****	***1 Enoch***	[1.]
New Jerusalem*	*Pseudo-Daniel**	***Four Kingdoms****	*Book of Giants**	***1 Enoch***
Visions of Amram*	***Sohn-Gottes-Text****	***Son of God****	*Daniel*	*Daniel 7*
*Aramaic Levi**	***Vier Reiche****	***Words of Michael****	*Pseudo-Daniel**	***New Jerusalem****
*Testament of Jacob (?)**	***1. Henochbuch***	*Birth of Noah**	***Son of God****	***Words of Michael****
*Apocryphon of Levi**	*Gigantenbuch**	*Apocryphon of Levi**	*Birth of Noah**	***Four Kingdoms****
*Testament of Qahat**	***Neue Jerusalem****	*Pseudo-Daniel**	*Aramaic Levi**	***Son of God****
*Testament of Judah**	***Vision Amrams****	***1 Enoch***	***New Jerusalem****	***Visions of Amram****
*Testament of Joseph**	***Worte Michaels****	***Visions of Amram****	*4QpapApocalypse (4Q489)**	[2.]
Son of God*		*Testament of Jacob (?)**	***Words of Michael****	*Apocryphon of Levi**
*Prayer of Nabonidus**			*Testament of Jacob (?)**	*Book of Giants**
*Jews in the Persian Court**		"and many other fragmentarily preserved compositions" (p. 483)	*Apocryphon of Levi**	*Birth of Noah**
*Daniel-Suzanna (?)**			*Testament of Qahath**	
*Birth of Noah**			***Visions of Amram****	
Four Kingdoms*			***Four Kingdoms****	
*4QVision a-c (4Q556-58)**			*4QVisiona-c (4Q556-58)**	
Words of Michael*			*6QApocalypse (6Q14)**	
Tobit				
*Genesis Apocryphon**				
1 Enoch				

1. See Dimant (1994). A more recent and restrictive list may be found in Dimant (2007), though there the list is titled "Visionary Compositions" and it is unclear whether Dimant intends to cover all texts considered apocalyptic. She does describe this later list as including "Aramaic visionary apocalyptic tales," but she does not directly address to what extent the categories "visionary compositions" and "apocalyptic texts" are coterminous. Her list is as follows: New *Jerusalem, Four Kingdoms, Apocryphon of Daniel, Words of Michael, Birth of Noah, Apocryphon of Levi, and Pseudo-Daniel*.

2. See Frey (2007).

3. See García Martínez (2010).

4. See DiTommaso (2010).

5. See Collins (2010).

Bibliography

Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra (eds) (2010), *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence 30 June–2 July 2008* (STDJ 94; Leiden: Brill).

J. Carmignac (1979), "Qu'est-ce que l'Apocalyptique? Son emploi à Qumran," *RevQ* 10/37: 3–33.

John J. Collins (1979), "Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a Genre," in *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre* (*Semeia* 14), 1–19.

John J. Collins (1998), *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*, 2nd edn (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).

John J. Collins (2010), "The Aramaic Texts from Qumran: Conclusions and Perspectives," in K. Berthelot and D. S. Ben Ezra (eds), *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence 30 June–2 July 2008* (STDJ 94; Leiden: Brill), 547–61.

Devorah Dimant (1994), "Apocalyptic Texts at Qumran," in E. Ulrich and J. VanderKam (eds), *The Community of the Renewed Covenant* (Notre Dame: University Press of Notre Dame), 175–91.

Devorah Dimant (2007), "The Qumran Aramaic Texts and the Qumran Community," in A. Hilhorst et al. (eds), *Flores Florentino: The Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (JSJSup 122; Leiden: Brill), 197–205.

Lorenzo DiTommaso (2010), "Apocalypticism and the Aramaic Texts from Qumran," in K. Berthelot and D. S. Ben Ezra (eds), *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence 30 June–2 July 2008* (STDJ 94; Leiden: Brill), 451–83.

Joseph A. Fitzmyer (2004), *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1 (1Q20): A Commentary*, 3rd edn (biblica et orientalia 18/B; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute).

Frances Flannery-Dailey (2004), *Dreamers, Scribes, and Priests: Jewish Dreams in the Hellenistic and Roman Eras* (JSJSup 90; Leiden: Brill).

Jörg Frey (2007), "Die Bedeutung der Qumran-Funde für das Verständnis der Apokalyptik im Frühjudentum und im Urchristentum," in J. Frey and M. Becker (eds), *Apokalyptik und Qumran* (Einblicke 10; Paderborn: Bonifatius), 11–16.

Florentino García Martínez (1986), "Encore l'Apocalyptique," *JSJ* 17: 224–32.

Florentino García Martínez (2010), "Aramaica qumranica apocalyptica?" in K. Berthelot and D. S. Ben Ezra (eds), *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence 30 June–2 July 2008* (STDJ 94; Leiden: Brill), 435–47.

Anathea Portier-Young (2011), *Apocalypse Aagainst Empire: Theologies of Resistance in Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).

Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar (2008), "The Imaginal Context and the Visionary of the Aramaic *New Jerusalem*," in A. Hilhorst et al. (eds), *Flores Florentino: The Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (JSJSup 122; Leiden: Brill), 257–70.

Hartmut Stegemann (1983), "Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für die Erforschung der Apokalyptik," in D. Hellholm (ed.), *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceeding of the International Colloqium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12–17, 1979* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983), 495–530.

Michael Stone (2011), *Ancient Judaism: New Visions and Views* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).

RESPONSE TO MACHIELA

Lester L. Grabbe

Daniel Machiela has written an interesting paper on the Aramaic apocalypses or related works at Qumran. I should mention that I wrote my overview paper *before* reading Daniel's paper. In any case, my address had little, if anything, new that I had not already argued with regard to apocalyptic works already in my 2003 paper; indeed, much was already in my 1989 article—nearly 25 years ago.[1]

One of the points that Daniel makes, with which I am in general agreement, is that a number of the apocalypses were probably written by priests. I have argued this at some length, but I was anticipated by Michael Stone, whose book, *Scriptures, Sects and Visions*, had already made this point in 1980.[2] It is a point well worth making, when we consider how many have argued that apocalypses are the product of sectarian—or "conventicle"—groups who are not in power, are outsiders, and have translated their worldview into mythical terms. This was already claimed by Otto Plöger in *Theokratie und Eschatologie* in 1959—an idea borrowed (with remarkable lack of acknowledgement) by Paul Hanson in his *Dawn of Apocalyptic*.[3]

The number of texts in which "Israelites or their ancestors interact with and assist the highest levels of the current foreign government" is not, however, "surprising." I already pointed out the fact that Persian-period writings often have this theme, and it continues into the Greek and Roman periods.[4] One can think of the Joseph story, the book of Esther, book of Ezra, as well as the book of Daniel.

The question of Aramaic being used for earlier Jewish apocalypses is an intriguing one, but I agree with Machiela that the reason is not likely to be ideological. It must also be kept in mind that Jewish society was bilingual by the Persian period and became trilingual with the coming of the Greeks. Not every Jew was bilingual, much less trilingual, but these languages were widely known and used. We have Hebrew writings such as Esther, Qohelet, Ben Sira, not to mention that Chronicles and Nehemiah were probably also from the early Greek period. Aramaic writings such as the Qumran Targum of Job, the *Megillat Taanit*, and many administrative documents, as well as ossuary and tomb inscriptions, were being produced in the later Greek and Roman periods. That most

1. Grabbe, "The Social Setting of Early Jewish Apocalypticism," *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 4 (1989): 27–47.

2. Michael E. Stone, *Scriptures, Sects and Visions: A Profile of Judaism from Ezra to the Jewish Revolts* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1980).

3. Otto Plöger, *Theokratie und Eschatologie* (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1959); ET *Theocracy and Eschatology* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1968); Paul D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1973).

4. See Grabbe, "Biblical Historiography in the Persian period: or How the Jews Took Over the Empire," in Steven W. Holloway (ed.), *Orientalism, Assyriology and the Bible* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2006), 400–14.

apocalyptic writings in the pre-Maccabean times are in Aramaic does not seem surprising to me.

I also thoroughly agree with the statement that the Maccabean crisis was not the origin of Jewish apocalyptic. As already stated, I believe we find apocalyptic-type writings, if not formal apocalypses, already in the Persian period, such as perhaps the Isaiah Apocalypse and possibly even the *Book of Watchers*. A good deal was also produced in the early Hellenistic period before 200 BCE, as Machiela suggests. Indeed, this seems to include some non-Jewish apocalypses, though they are not necessarily in Aramaic.[5] However, it is clear that apocalypses arising from the Maccabean crisis do exist, the primary one being the book of Daniel. Here Machiela has not convinced me that Daniel 7 is pre-Maccabean. I think it is an Aramaic apocalypse, alongside the Hebrew apocalypse of the rest of the book (Chapters 8–12). I believe Daniel is evidence that Aramaic apocalypses occasioned by the Maccabean Revolt were written; they are not non-existent. Some of the other apocalypses listed by Machiela might also be Maccabean in origin, considering the difficulties in dating. What Machiela has shown is that many Aramaic apocalypses—but not all—are pre-Maccabean.

5. See the discussion in Grabbe, *A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period 2: The Coming of the Greeks: The Early Hellenistic Period (335-175 BCE)* (Library of Second Temple Studies 68; London and New York: T&T Clark International, 2008), 306–11.

2

An Unlikely Mixture: Seleucids and Lagids in Daniel and in Persian Apocalyptic

Vicente Dobroruka

The end of Nebuchadnezzar's dream in Daniel 2

The question regarding the antiquity of Persian apocalyptic literature is one of the most ardently debated in Oriental Studies. The main manuscripts, being from the Islamic period or, at least, from Sassanian times (224–651 CE), have so far pushed scholars to a dead end. There is one problem, however: the manuscripts are no older than the ninth century CE, and their content is either corrupted or their arrangement is obviously of a later date; but on the other hand the themes discussed can easily be traced to either Avestan material or to classical sources much older (e.g. Theopompus of Chios).

This paper proposes a new look into one those texts, the *Zand-ī Wahman Yasn* (*ZWY*), specifically into two lines of the text that bear a striking resemblance to Daniel 2.31-43. These lines refer, according to the most usual Danielic exegesis, to intermarriage between Lagids and Seleucids; the Persian passages also refer to a sort of mixture, but without any hint at dynasties such as in Daniel 2. I hope this cross-examination in the light of the political situation in Palestine at the beginning of the second century BCE will help clear the debate on the antiquity of that Persian apocalypse, the *ZWY*.[1]

1. For practical reasons and given the constraints of time and space, I cannot repeat here the whole discussion on the nature of the world empires in Daniel. Suffice it to say that after the 1930s the debate was settled by Rowley's decisive arguments favoring the sequence Babylon—Media—Persia—Macedonian Empire—the Diadochi. Of the many and sometimes whimsical variants found in the course of time the really important one is that already found in Antiquity which replaces Alexander's Empire by Rome (e.g. Josephus. *Jewish Antiquities* 10.263; 4 Ezra 12:10). As a fine introduction to the theme as it appears in Daniel, I refer the reader to Harold H. Rowley, *Darius, the Mede and the Four World Empires in the Book of Daniel: A Historical Study of Contemporary Theories* (Cardiff: University of Wales, 1935).

1.

Around 167 BCE, as Antiochus IV Epiphanes made his infamous move on the internal quarrels of the Jews of Palestine regarding who should have highest authority—namely, their high priest, the splitting of the Near East between the remnants of Alexander's political heirs in the region, in this case the Lagids and Seleucids, had undergone a recent change, and one that would have the most profound effect on the historical development of the region.

Summing up the factual history of the time immediately prior to the Maccabean Revolt, we may see in verse 43 of Daniel an allusion to the marriage between Antiochus II and Berenice (252 BCE), in order to seal the treaty, end the Second Syrian War (260–253 BCE) and make peace with Ptolemy II of Egypt (she was his daughter) and, as a consequence, to the Laodicean War (246 BCE: possible reference in Dan. 11.7–11 to Laodice I coming back and causing Antiochus II Theos to leave Berenice); however, we could also see verse 43 as an allusion to 193 BCE, with the intervention of the Romans against Antiochus III in his attempt to conquer Greece.

Now Daniel is a remarkably awkward source for factual history (let us just remember the figure of "Darius, the Mede"—Dan. 5.31); nonetheless, both its final redaction[2] and its *ex eventu* prophecy in Chapter 2 allude, very precisely, to political events happening at that time in Judaea. The author of that section in Daniel 2 is in charge of both telling Nebuchadnezzar the Babylonian king what he has dreamed and also providing an explanation.

What follows is a remarkable weaving together of three mythical complexes: the "ages of the world," to be found in many places but more importantly in Hesiod's *Works and Days*; the "metals in decaying sequence" (here the *ZWY* is one of the most ancient witnesses) and finally the "world empires," already found in Herodotus (*Histories* 1.95; 130).

The passage is too widely known to be repeated *in toto*, so let me just quote the important ending in Daniel 2:41:

> As you saw the feet and toes partly of potter's clay and partly of iron, it shall be a divided kingdom; but some of the strength of iron shall be in it, as you saw the iron mixed with the clay.

And the Greek has one variation between the LXX[3] and Theodotion's recension; so, taking only the very end, we have in the LXX [...] ἐν αὐτῇ, καθάπερ εἶδες τὸν σίδηρον ἀναμεμειγμένον ἅμα τῷ πηλίνῳ ὀστράκῳ "in it, just as you saw the iron mixed at the same time with clay ware," but in Theodotion's […]ἐν αὐτῇ, ὃν

2. Cf. Rowley, 76–7, for some amusing possibilities of the mixtures alluded to, and for a more detailed discussion on the "mixture," cf. André LaCoque, *Daniel in His Time* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1996), 65–6.

3. Here as in other Greek OT references I will be following Rahlf's text as printed in *Bible Works 7.0*, CD-ROM edition, unless noted otherwise.

τρόπον εἶδες τὸν σίδηρον ἀναμεμειγμένον τῷ ὀστράκῳ "in it, as you saw the iron mixed with earthenware". This means only that in the LXX text, the translator considered it important to state that the mixture of the elements was simultaneous (provided by the term ἅμα "at the same time"). This reinforces the idea of intermarriages, since a marriage, by definition, is a union between two parts at one given moment.

The elements here are both a metal, fitting to the sequence—which is, after all, of metals too—and the most fearsome of them, iron. Now, the other element seems misplaced, both in terms of its intrinsic value and of its nature: clay is not a metal and is by far more common and vulgar than any of the previous elements in the statue. It must be said that the composer or compiler of this section of Daniel does not establish any distinction between Lagids or Selecuids representing either iron or clay: this could mean that he does consider both of the same value, or simply that he was not interested in their dynastic arrangements—it would not matter to him which could be "more prized",= since according to God's plan both are doomed.

Daniel 2:42 is of little interest to us here, since it only provides a very naïve explanation of the unsuitability of iron mixing with an uncongenial element, clay. All versions state the same. In 2:43 we have the point stated in a finer manner:

> As you saw the iron mixed with clay, so will they mix with one another in marriage, but they will not hold together, just as iron does not mix with clay.

In Greek it reads συγκρθῆναι "to blend or unite" and in Theodotion again a slight variation, ἀναμεμείγνυται"to mix together or have intercourse."

Now going to the components of the Danielic passage, without entering into further detail, it should be stated that *all of them* can be traced to earlier times than those of the writing of Daniel as it has come to us in its present form[4]. The ages together with the metals can be traced to Hesiod at least, but probably to an earlier past;[5] the theme of the world empires appears already in Herodotus, as we saw, but even if we were looking for an earlier Biblical passage this could be found in Tobit 14:4. We are on safe ground then to state that, since the book of Daniel as a whole may draw on much older material in some of its sections[6], for the purposes of this paper we are dealing with material older than the second century BCE, woven together by the time of the Maccabbean Revolt and with a significant addition of the intermarriage theme.

4. Bibliography is immense here—as a short but very carefully researched introduction to the theme I suggest Geo Widengren et al. *Apocalyptique iranienne et dualisme qoumrânien*. Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve, 1995.

5. In any case, at least by 600 BCE Hesiodic *motifs* related to the *Works and Days* can be found all over the Aegean; this evidence includes pottery. Cf. Martin L.West. *Hesiod. Works & Days*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978) 60–1.

6. John J. Collins. *Daniel: a Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press), 2ff.

Now, the next question is, can the "mixture" of iron and clay *be proved* contemporary with the theme to which it refers?

2.

Let us take a look at similar passages in the *ZWY*, as they came down to us—in other words, the passages referring to a mixture of iron with "something else" (literally, "the domain of iron mixed"—*āhan abar gumēxt*), in a context similar to that of Daniel 2:43: in *ZWY* 1.11 (transcription for both passages given in the footnote),

> /11/ *And the one on which iron had been mixed is the evil rule of the parted hair of dēws of the seed of Xēšm, when it will be the end of your tenth century, o Spitāmān Zarduxšt'.*

And then, in the second passage, *ZWY* 3.19–29,

> /29/ *The one on which iron had been mixed is the evil dominion of the parted hair dēws of the seed of Xēšm, when it will be the end of the tenth century of your millenium, o Spitāmān Zarduxšt'*[7].

First of all it must be stated that there is no clear explanation, in the *ZWY*, for *what* is being mixed;[8] for that explanation (if indeed there is a sound one) we need to take several problems into account and possibly go much further back in our assessment of the source.

In passages *ZWY* 1 and 3 we have almost the identical identification of the main evil-bearers of the last age: they "have parted hair" (*wizārd-wars*—a difficult

7. Following the transcription of Cereti (I found transliteration to be unnecessary in a paper on this subject, so only the transcription follows), we have for ZWY 1.11: *ud ān i āhan abar gumēxt *ēstād duš-pādixšayih i dēwan ī wizārd-wars ī xēšm-tōhmag, ka dahom sadōzan ī tō sar bawēd, spitāmān zarduxšt* and, on ZWY 3.29, *ud ān i āhan abar gumēxt *ēstād duš-pādixšayih i dēwan ī wizārd-wars ī xēšm-tōhmag spitāmān zarduxšt hazārag sar ī tō sar bawēd, spitāmān zarduxšt*. Cf. Carlo G. Cereti (ed.). *The Zand i Wahman Yasn: a Zoroastrian Apocalypse* (Roma: Istituto italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1995), 133–5.

8. This is not the subject of this paper but is a matter that is directly linked to it – cf. Philippe Gignoux. "Sur l'inexistence d'un *Bahman Yasht* avestique" in: *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 32, 1986. P.58 for a very ingenious (but not at all convincing) attempt to show there the "dust" or "earth" were in fact present in the "original" text of the ZWY, but got lost; cf. also the somewhat naïve response by Mary Boyce. "The poems of the Persian Sybil" in *Études irano-aryennes offertes à Gilbert Lazard* (Paris: Associacion pour l'avancement dês études iraniennes, 1989), 73–4.

hint to help identify them) and as for the rest, there are a few subtleties in the translation not relevant to our theme.

The consequences of their rule are the same in both *ZWY* 1 and 3; so is the catalogue of disgraces the usual since Hesiodic times, but with Zoroastrian overtones—there is the important reference to the millennium of Zoroaster coming to an end. This means that this version of the "ages of the world" scheme has distinctly Zoroastrian overtones here.

One very important aspect not to be overlooked upon is the dating of these texts. The debate about an Avestan-*Vorlage* of the Pahlavi texts is apparently never ending; if we did have an Avestan counterpart for that passage in the *ZWY* (i.e. if we did have, as concrete evidence, a *Yašt* in the name of Bahman, or Vohuman, the deity of "Good Thought"), things would be far easier. We do have *zands* for other texts (a fine example would be the Avestan vs. the Pahlavic *Yasna* 31.14)[9], so this points out to the logical possibility: *why* would anyone make a commentary on a non-existent text?

The possibility that we may be dealing with a very old literary *topos*, namely that of the "ages of the world," going back to a putative Indo-European origin is to be considered but this is scarcely the place to discuss it[10]. If this is so, then another

9. Yuhan S.-D. Vevaina. "'Misegenation', 'mixture' and 'mixed iron'. The hermeneutics, historiography and cultural poesis of the 'Four Ages' in Zoroastrianism" in: Philippa Townsend and Moulie Vidas (eds.). *Revelation, Literature and Community in Late Antiquity* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 249–50.

10. Cf. Vicente Dobroruka. "Hesiodic reminiscences in Zoroastrian-Hellenistic apocalypses" in: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* (forthcoming); Mary Boyce. "On the antiquity of Zoroastrian apocalyptic" in: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 47: 57–75, 1984; Norman Cohn. *Cosmos, Chaos and the World to Come* (Hew Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), 79–80, 96, 105ff.; Geo Widengren. "Les quatre ages du monde" in: Geo Widengren et al. *Apocalyptique iranienne et dualisme qoumrânien*. Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve, 1995; John J. Collins. "Persian apocalypses" in *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre* (Semeia 14, 1979). 207–18; Samuel K. Eddy. *The King is Dead. Studies in the Near Eastern Resistance to Hellenism 334–31 B.C.* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961), 20 ; Anders Hultgård, "Mythe et histoire dans l'Iran ancien. Étude de quelques thèmes dans le *Bahman Yast*" in Widengren, *Apocalyptique iranienne*, 67ff.; and above all Hans Windisch. *Die Orakel des Hystaspes* (Amsterdam: Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam, 1929). For the opponents of the anteriority of Persian apocalyptic, please cf. Jacques Duchesne-Guillemin. "Apocalypse juive et apocalypse iranienne" in: Ugo Bianchi and Maarten J. Vermaseren. *La soteriologia dei culti orientali nell'Impero romano: atti del Colloquio internazionale su la soteriologia dei culti orientali nell'Impero romano, Roma, 24–28 settembre 1979* (Leiden: Brill, 1982), 753, 759; Gignoux is, apparently, the most outspoken proponent of the view that Persian apocalyptic is either too late to be taken as an effective influence to its Jewish counterpart or is to be considered a response to the Arab invasion. Cf. "L'apocalyptique iranienne est-elle vraiment la source d'autres apocalypses?" in: *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 31 (1–2) (1988): 67–78, 71–6ff. It should be noted in passing that are serious works, besides those

factor must be taken into account: that the *topos* was somehow modified by the author of this section of Daniel (who had, besides, to cope with the image of the statue)[11] and dealt with in minutiae to allude to the failed diplomatic marriage arrangements of Lagids and Seleucids.

Now this last proposition is almost self-explanatory: in Daniel 2:43 itself we find the indications needed to understand what the author means by the mixture of unmixable components. On the other hand, is the author of Daniel 2:31-43 *really* taking hold of an earlier, Persian *topos* that talks about iron mixed with something else?

To answer that, two issues should be taken into consideration: one is that the Persian texts we are dealing with, especially the *ZWY*, are very late *as we have them;* their mss. are of the Islamic period, with emendations and missing parts (although, from the four extant copies in Pahlavi of the *ZWY*, none of these corrupted bits affects the understanding of the "mixture").

Another point to be understood is that raised by what "mixture" implied to the writer of Daniel 4:43 and to the compiler(s) of the *ZWY* as we have it.

For by "mixture" one can also understand the damage done to the "pure" creation of Ohrmazd after its attack by Ahriman (in Zoroastrian theology the material world is a good thing, no "prison for the souls" or anything of the sort, because only in the material world can Ahriman be destroyed). So the "mixture" in the *ZWY could* be just a mentioning of the idea that iron, once pure, was at some point polluted. This befits the rest of the description of the last age in both *ZWY* 1 and 3—they are the worst and thus, most polluted times of all.[12]

3.

Another important issue to be taken into account is whether we can relate Daniel 2:43 to the general pattern of native revolts in the Hellenistic world as proposed

of Gignoux and Duchesne-Guillemin, that defend a Syrian-Mesopotamian origin for the mythical complex of the ages of the world; among these, should mention Helge S. Kvanvig. *Roots of Apocalyptic: the Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988; Walter Burkert. "Apokalyptik im frühen Griechentum: Impulse und Transformationen" in: Hellholm, op.cit. and André Caquot. "Les enfants aux cheveux blancs" in: *Mélanges d'histoire des religions offerts à Henri-Charles Puech* (aris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1974).

11. The statue may be more important than one thinks at first sight: in the Second Century CE the gnostic Bardesanes described, from a report by Indian envoys, that in the centre of the Earth was a statue of the primeval man, a representation o the whole world and of what is contained therein. Cf. Stobeaus 2.2, quoted by Widengren, "Les quatre âges", p.26.

12. The term can be found in several Zoroastrian sources, but cf. e.g. the *Greater Bundahišn* 93–94; cf. also Robert C. Zaehner. *The Dawn and Twilight of Zoroastrianism* (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1965), 265–6ff.

by Eddy.[13] For there is a huge span of time covering the events in Daniel in its final form—i.e. around 164 BCE—and those reported in a supposedly pre-Christian *Bahman Yašt*, which goes back to the mythical kingship of Vištasp, Zoroaster's protector.[14]

To begin with, Iranian lands were among the first to get rid of their Seleucid overlords—in 247 BCE, and so we would need to dislocate the dreaded "devils with parted hair" from the *ZWY* to a very distant time and place (e.g. to the Turkish invaders around the eleventh century CE)[15], or else consider the *ZWY* exactly as it intends to be—a *zand* "commentary" in Pahlavi (from the Avestan *zainti*, "explanation," "understanding").

It would in this case "comment" on the misdeeds of a pre-Middle Persian time, most likely that of the Greek invasion, according to Eddy. In any case, the compiler, writer or revisor of the *ZWY* does not imply that the mixture refers to dynastic troubles. In fact, he leaves us clueless as to the very nature of that mixture, except that it refers to iron.

This is significant, for of all the ages found in most variants of what I would call the "Hesiodic type" the iron age is the only one to which a historical existence can be ascribed.[16] On the other hand, the sequence of ages—and of empires—is, in the *ZWY* 1 and 3, "mixed" itself: some kingdoms are historical, some are not.

One hint at that—since some of the kingdoms referred to as very late, such as the one of Khusraw (531–579 CE), is that the commentator took his task literally and updated the apocalyptic historical data; this looks, at first hand, as if the compiler(s) of the *ZWY*: (1) were unaware of dynastic troubles between Lagids and Seleucids; (2) did not care about them; or (3) were too far away (geographically) removed to know anything about it.

The three possible explanations given above can all have a ring of truthfulness around them; (1) looks especially adequate if we take the line that the *ZWY* is merely a late concoction of bits and pieces, with no pre-Christian antecedent. But the lack of relation between the "mixtures" in Daniel and in the *ZWY* can mean something else.

4.

So, there are both currents denying the previous existence of a sort of *Bahman*

13. Eddy, op.cit.

14. Some claim that this Vištasp is the same individual that we know to be the father of Darius, thus displacing the time of Zoroaster's living by several centuries, but this is notthe place to discuss this possibility.

15. A common identification of these late invaders has since the nineteenth century been the Turks – so Edward W. West. *The Bundahišn, Bahman Yašt, and Shāyast lā-shāyast*, Pahlavi Texts 37 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1880), 202; Cereti, op.cit., 174 (suggestions found in Vevaina, op.cit., 247).

16. Arnaldo Momigliano, *On Pagans, Jews and Christians* (Hanover: Wesleyan University Press, 1987), 49 and Vevaina, op.cit., 239.

Yašt (arguably an Avestan one) and another current that points out to its likely existence; I align myself with the latter, if for no other reason than the fact that a *zand* makes better sense if it is a commentary on a previous text (as seen in the case of the *Yasna*).

But even considering that there could be a commentary of a non-existant *Yašt*, I think there is a very strong argument so far overlooked supportive of the anteriority of the *Bahman Yašt* in relation to Daniel.

Regarding the "ages of the world," it is out of the question that the earliest *written* record for the theme is that of Hesiod; the same cannot be said, however, about the theme of the world empires. In that regard, Daniel shows a much more developed theory than that of the *ZWY* (one must be careful here because the *ZWY* is, with or without a previous *Yašt* of Bahman or Wahman, a late, Islamic-period text with many layers of redactional activity); in particular, it strikes me that *all* of the kingdoms in Daniel had historical existence, whereas in the *ZWY* some are historical and some are mythical; this happens both in the *ZWY* 1 with its four empire sequence and in Chapter 3 with the seven empires. It seems logical, in my view, to move from a semi-historical background with partially historical kingdoms to one where all of the kingdoms are historical.

This is a problem; after Vevaina's arguments that the "ages of the world" plus "world empires" took a different, markedly Zoroastrian direction in the *ZWY* (of which he only analyzes Chapter 1, and focuses more on Chapter 9 of the *Dēnkard*), the "ages of the world theme" needs not stem from a common source; but we may be facing a theme whose origins may be very dispersed over a great length of time and space. However, this is not the focus of Vevaina's excellent analysis, and should be left aside for the current purposes.

Contemporary to the canonical Danielic passages are the fragments from Qumran Cave 4. These have been examined elsewhere by many scholars, in particular by García Martínez,[17] but, although dealing with similar themes to those in canonical Daniel, they are in too fragmentary form to be of any use in dating with precision the "mixture" mentioned in the *ZWY*.

These are the main arguments regarding the anteriority of the *ZWY* passages

17. For the complete text cf. Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Study Edition*, 2 vols (Leiden and Grand Rapids: Brill/Eerdmans, 2000) and for specific articles, Józef T. Milik, "Prière de Nabonide et autres écrits d'un cycle de Daniel," in *Revue Biblique*, 63 (1956); Frank M. Cross, "Fragments of the Prayer of Nabonidus," in *Israel Exploration Journal*, 34 (1984); Florentino García Martínez, "The Prayer of Nabonidus: A New Synthesis," in Florentino García Martínez (ed.), *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (Leiden: Brill, 1992); Émile Puech, "La prière de Nabonide (4Q242)," in Kevin J. Cathcart and Michael Maher (eds), *Targumic and Cognate Studies: Essays in Honour of Martin McNamara* (Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1996). But even more important for the issues on the Pseudo-Danielic fragments are Florentino García Martínez, "4Q Pseudo Daniel Aramaic and the Pseudo Daniel Literature," in García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, and John J. Collins, "Pseudo-Daniel revisited," in *Revue de Qumran*, 17 (1996).

in relation to the Lagid-Seleucid troubles described in Daniel 2:43. Recapitulating, they involve:

i. The mixed elements in Daniel 2:31-43 are openly tailored to Lagid-Seleucid dynastic troubles; in that respect, even though the author of these sections of Daniel is, as usual throughout the book, ill-informed, he points out unmistakably to historical events that can be paralleled to Antiochus II, Berenice, and the mélée that ensued.
ii. The "ages of the world" plus "world kingdoms" as they appear in the *ZWY* and other Zoroastrian literature all show a world where Iranian sovereignty and, by extension, the goodness of Zoroastrianism, are threatened. Some of these passages, like the Pahlavic *zand* on the *Yasna* quoted above, do have Avestan antecedents, thus providing a case for the same possibly happening to a pre-Christian *Bahman Yast* that furnished the basic structure on which Daniel 2 would be based.
iii. The "native revolt pattern" (i.e. the anti-Hellenistic ones such as those studied by Eddy) fits assumedly into Daniel 2, but not so into what is left of the *ZWY*; it looks anterior from this point of view (check point 4) and less developed, as if containing a proto-form of a sequence of kingdoms, good and bad, mythical and historical, that could later be used as anti-Hellenistic propaganda[18].
iv. The Qumranic fragments, which are in a very bad state of preservation—all of them from Cave 4, let us remember that—bear witness to themes similar to those in the *ZWY* in a number of ways. Considering their date and the arguments aligned between issues 1-3, they should be taken into serious consideration in dating the *ZWY* or, if I may, the putative *Bahman Yašt* itself.

Conclusion

The main arguments of this paper could thus be summarized in two main points:

1. There *may* be a version of the "mixed iron" theme (as we found in Pahlavic sources) that is previous to the one so carefully crafted and developed in Daniel 2:43;
2. The argument of point (1) above can be put forward to reinforce the idea that the *ZWY*, or at least the section of the "mixing" in Chapters 1 and 3, is in fact a *zand* of a previous text that dealt with resistance to Hellenism as a whole but was not aware, did not care, or was too far removed to deal with the quarrels between Lagids and Seleucids.

18. And for that matter, even be used by non-Iranians—notwithstanding Gignoux's objections, I think that arguments supportive of the anteriority of the *ZWY* in relation to Danielic literature in Chapters 2 and 7 are more plentiful and of a better quality.

Response to Dobroruka

Lester L. Grabbe

Vincente Dobroruka had my attention from just his title. I have long had an interest in the question of Iranian influence on Judaism, especially on Jewish eschatology. There are a few good studies by biblical scholars, but it is difficult to find good studies by ancient Persian specialists on the question. I surveyed what I knew of in an appendix in the Persian-period volume of my history of Second Temple Judaism, but the question deserves a full-length study.[1]

Apart from the difficulties of language or even of finding reliable textual edition, eschatological, or apocalyptic works, the problems are essentially two, if I understand correctly:

1. Dating of Zoroastrian literature. Most of the works we have date from the ninth century CE, i.e. post-Islam. Some argue that they were preserved orally from Zarathushtra's own time—an argument made by no less a figure than the late Mary Boyce—but many are not willing to concede they are so old or that they were preserved unchanged for so long a time.
2. In some cases, the original work is lost, and what is preserved is a supposed commentary on it. This is the case with the most well-known Iranian apocalyptic work, the *Zand-ī Vohuman Yašt*, sometimes referred to as the *Bahman Yašt*, which is in theory a commentary on a work no longer extant.

I agree with Dobroruka that the "metallic ages" and the "succession of empires" are both probably ancient motifs. Our problem is to document them in literary writings. In this case, the phrase in the *Zand-ī Vohuman Yašt* (1 and 3) is probably ancient and could easily be earlier than Daniel, though proving that might be difficult. More could be said about the nature and dating of Zoroastrian literature at this point, but I shall postpone that discussion—with the appropriate references—for the final chapter (see the section "Jewish Apocalyptic and Iranian Influence" [pp. 245–8] below).

1. Grabbe, *A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period 1: Yehud: A History of the Persian Province of Judah* (London and New York: T&T Clark International, 2004), 361–4.

SESSION 2

3

Texts on Messianic Reign from the Hasmonean Period: 4Q521 as Interpretation of Daniel 7

Torleif Elgvin

Both Daniel 7 and 4Q521 describe a redemptive figure with universal power, and continue with the end-time renewal and dominion of the people of God. The redemptive figure is designated differently in these two writings (Son of Man versus messiah). But the structural similarities between the texts lead me to ask whether the Qumran text could represent a later interpretation of Daniel 7.

The Son of Man in Daniel 7:9-14 may be read as a messianic figure with heavenly features, to whom is given an eternal kingdom and authority over all nations. In the following interpretation of the vision (7:15-27), the kingdom is given to the people of God.

4Q521 1 ii 1–2 proclaim that "]heaven and earth will obey his messiah, [and all t]hat is in them will not turn away from the commandments of the holy ones."[1] I suggest that the author of these lines read Daniel 7:13-14 as a heavenly inauguration of Israel's Davidic messiah. The anointed of 4Q521, given universal power, is more easily interpreted in light of biblical texts on the ruling son of David, rather than texts referring to anointed priests or prophets.[2] 4Q521 is an extra-sectarian text with no identity markers of the *Yahad*, so a messianic image different from those prevalent in the *Yahad* is conceivable.

4Q521 1 ii 4–14 describe the eschatological renewal of Israel, with Ps 146 and 1 Sam 2 among the texts of reference. These lines may be read as an interpretation of Daniel 7:15-27, focusing on the people of the messiah: The enthronement of a royal messiah in heaven will lead to a renewal of God's people on earth. This understanding of 4Q521 would explain the enigmatic words "He will honor the

1. For the interpretation history of 4Q521, see Justnes 2007: 179–88; Novakovic 2007.

2. Puech favors a plural understanding of משיחו, which should refer to a plurality of messianic figures, priest, king, and perhaps also prophet: *DJD* 25: 12; Puech 1999: 564. Hultgren argues for a Davidic messiah: Hultgren 2008: 330–8.

pious on the eternal royal throne" (line 7)—as Daniel 7:15-27 has awarded the messianic people kingdom and reign.[3]

The "holy ones" of 4Q521 may be identified with the angels of Daniel 7:10, who are witnesses to the end-time judgement, implemented according to commandments given from heaven. If 4Q521 refers to texts from Daniel, מצות קדושים may echo another Daniel passage about the judgement on Nebuchadnezzar, גזרת עירין "decree of the watchers," מאמר קדישין "word of the holy ones" (4:14/4:17). מצות קדושים may thus be a parallel term to חק חסדך "the precept of your favor" (4Q521 2 iii 1).

Line 3 runs: "You who seek the Lord, strengthen yourself when you *serve him*." The suffix of בעבדתו could refer not to God but the messiah whom all on earth shall obey, and recall all people serving/worshipping the Son of Man in Daniel 7:14.[4] [5]

A number of texts from the second century onwards connect elect individuals with the heavenly realms. The Self-Glorification Hymn (4Q471b, 4Q491c), a *Yahad* text included in the Hodayot, provides evidence for the idea of a human figure enthroned in heaven, albeit a priestly one. 1QSb IV blesses the high priest with similar terminology, he is given a place of honor with the angels of heaven. Also the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, a liturgy with possible roots in the pre-Maccabean temple, share the idea of an online connection between earthly subjects and their angelic counterparts.

According to Andrei Orlov, texts from the second century onwards envisage a heavenly counterpart, a "twin," for biblical sages with a mediatory or revealing role. This is clearly stated with regard to Jacob in the Slavonic *Ladder of Jacob* and to Enoch in 2 Enoch. And this idea may explain the relation between Moses and the angel of the presence in *Jubilees*, Moses and the celestial figure in *Exagoge of Ezekiel the Tragedian* (similarly in 4Q377 2), and Enoch and the Son of Man in the Similitudes.[6] Further, Melchizedeq appears as celestial priest and/or angelic warrior in 2 Enoch 23 and three Qumran texts (4QVisions of Amram, 4Q Songs

3. Puech sees the eternal royal throne, unique in OT and Qumran, as a development of "trone de gloire" in 1 Sam 2:7-8, and of the throne of God together with the throne and reign given the Son of Man and the saints of the Most High in Daniel 7 (*DJD* 25: 13–14).

4. Line 3 should be read with lines 1–2, not with the continuation. The *vacat* at the end of line 3 and the cryptic sign in the right margin are section markers: Tov 2004: 186.

5. The importance of 4Q521 1 ii 1–3 alongside Daniel 7 as background for Matt. 28:17-20 should be considered. There is a remarkable similarity between "All authority has been given unto me in heaven and on earth" and "heaven and earth will obey his messiah." Compare further "they worshipped him"/"strengthen yourself when you serve/worship him"; "observe all things I commanded you"/"the commandments of the holy ones"; and perhaps the "Father–Son" duality in v. 20 with the roles of God and the messiah in 4Q521 1 ii.

6. Orlov 2007; Orlov 2004. Heavenly counterparts for these sages recur in the targums and other rabbinic texts as well as hekhalot literature.

of the Sabbath Sacrifice [4Q401 11 3], 11QMelchizedeq), and he might have an earthly counterpart in Genesis 14, as presupposed in Hebrews 7.

A crux for many interpreters of 4Q521 is the lack of any direct line between the anointed in line 2 and the glorious acts performed by God in lines 5–13 (cf. Becker 2007: 264–6). With Daniel 7 as a reference text, this is easily explained. Here the Son of Man is not mentioned in the section about God's people, vv. 15–27, the redeeming acts are caused by the Ancient of Days, v. 22.

There are features in Daniel 7 not recurring in 4Q521, such as the beasts and the suffering of God's people. 4Q521 2 ii is poetically formed and may be seen as a hymnic text concentrating on the elements of redemption in Daniel 7 and Ps 146 (Niebuhr 1998; Justnes 2007: 258–63). But the "undertext" of the admonition to the faithful (ll. 3–4) and the great acts of God (ll. 5–13) could be a situation of trials, which would mean that the author and the group he admonishes did not enjoy the protection and wealth of the Hasmonean rulers.

4Q521 should be dated somewhere in the Hasmonean period; Puech dates the script to 100–80 BCE (*DJD* 25: 5). If this text foresees a Davidic messiah at a time with ruling priests, it probably belongs to a milieu at some distance from the Hasmoneans. These factors point to an author group different from the Hasmoneans and the *Yahad*. The Pharisees who fell from influence under Hyrcanus and were in active conflict with Janneus in the nineties could be an option. In this case, the milieu behind 4Q521 would be a precursor of the circles behind the *Psalms of Solomon*, which likely derive from Pharisaic circles in the period 90–50 BCE.[7]

Whatever the author of Daniel 7 put into his "Son of Man," 4Q521 may show that this text already in the second century was read as referring to a Davidic messiah. *Pace* Sjöberg and Nickelsburg, "Son of Man" could have been a traditional messianic title long before the *Similitudes of Enoch* (cf. Sjøberg 1946: 58; Nickelsburg and VanderKam 2011: 113–16, Horbury 2003: 139–52).

The Son of Man in Daniel 7

In his commentary Collins lists three main lines of interpretation for the Son of Man in Daniel 7: 1) an exalted human being; 2) a collective symbol; 3) a heavenly being. Collins sympathizes with the third option (Collins 1993: 308). The first option should be given more serious attention in light of texts from the scrolls and Enochic writings that refer to humans being exalted to the heavenly realms. I sympathize with the minority of modern scholars who see the Son of Man as an exalted messianic figure (see in particular Noth 1928; Gese 1977: 152–9). The authority he is given over peoples and nations is easiest read in light of biblical

7. *Ps. Sol.* 17 envisages an earthly Davidic messiah, but without the military might of the Hasmonean rulers.

texts on the future rule of the Davidic king. Biblical texts before Daniel 7 do not afford angelic figures with universal rule or a *Grossreich*.[8]

Early Davidic psalms and prophetic texts evidence the idea or ideal of a Davidic *Grossreich*, where the Davidic king will rule over a large territory with peoples paying homage to him: Psalms 2.8–11; Micah 5.3–5; Psalms 89.26. In exilic and postexilic texts such an earthly Davidic kingdom is transformed to a *Weltreich*: עד אפסי ארץ, originally intended as "to the borders of the land" (Mic. 5.3), would now be read "to the ends of the earth" (Ps. 72.8–11; Zech. 9.10). כל הארץ, originally read as "all the land," becomes "all the earth." "From the sea to the sea" and "from the River to the sea," originally read as "from the Mediterranean to the Dead Sea/the Gulf of Aqaba" and "from Euphrates to the Mediterranean," become terms for a Davidic *Weltreich* (Am 8.12, Ps. 72.8, Zech. 9.10, cf. Ps. 89.26; see Sæbø 1978). The *Weltreich* attributed to the son of David in these texts would easily be connected to some kind of heavenly legitimation or enthronization.

Isaiah 11:6-10 and Amos 9:11-15 describe a restored Davidic kingdom with terminology easily connected to some kind of new creation, even if these passages originally were coined in symbolic language. A Davidic figure with a heavenly role and universal rule could find support in texts such as Psalms 45:7, easiest read as a vocative where the Davidic king is addressed as *elohim* "heavenly being," and Psalms 72, which asserts that all nations shall serve him and his name shall last forever (vv. 11, 17).

An earthly Davidic kingdom that breaks through old patterns would need some kind of heavenly support. I would interpret the Son of Man in Daniel 7 on this background. If the Son of Man is some kind of Davidic figure, one can perceive three alternative options:

1. An earthly Davidic king being "online" with heaven while he still rules on earth;
2. A heavenly figure given a messianic office, in the image of a ben-David on earth;
3. The earthly messianic king being elevated to heaven and enthroned, as happens with Enoch in 1 Enoch 37–71.

1 Enoch 11–16/17–36, texts from the third and early second century, portray Enoch, a human figure, moved to the heavenly realms. Could the ideal son of David in a similar way be moved to heaven?[9]

In this context I want to revive Noth's hypothesis that the vision of the Ancient

8. The seventy shepherds of 1 Enoch 89–90 who receive power to torment Israel may be guardian angels of the oppressing peoples (cf. the princes of Persia and Greece, Dan. 10:13-20), or demonic angels (cf. מלאכי מסטמות in 4QApocryphon of Jeremiah C[e] 4Q387 2 iii 4; 4Q390 1 11; 2 i 7).

9. In the Gabriel Inscription from the late first century BCE the prophet listens to a dialogue between the Davidic messiah and God or the angel Gabriel (ll. 16–23). This dialogue is probably located to the heavenly realms. Cf. Elgvin 2012: 223.

of Days and the Son of Man is a separate poetic unit that was combined with the *Four Kingdoms*-vision by the editor of Daniel 7.[10]

Daniel 7:9–10.13-14 would make sense as a text from the Ptolemaic or Seleucid period in Judea, with a vision of God (cp. the contemporary vision in 1 Enoch 14, the second-century vision in the Enochic *Book of Giants*, 4Q530 II 16–20, and biblical visions such as Exod. 24:9–11; Isa. 6; Ezek. 1) and a Davidic messiah enthroned in heaven. At a time of powerful earthly empires, there are small chances on the political scene to see any Davidic kingdom in the horizon. Further, the power in Jerusalem would belong to the high priest, a central figure in expectations of other texts about the redeemed Zion. With a powerful anointed priest one does not necessarily need a Son of David at his side. How then should Davidic promises from the Bible be interpreted? One could either transfer the Davidic figure to the end-times or elevate him to the heavens.

In texts such as the full version of Daniel 7 and 4Q521, a heavenly Davidic messiah could be seen as the guarantee for the end-time rule of the people of God on earth.[11] With a late dating of the full version of Daniel 7, the lack of any earthly ruler in this text could suggest an agenda critical of the early Hasmonean rulers.

There are signals in Daniel 7 that pave the way for the later interpretation of the Son of Man as "messiah" in the Similitudes of Enoch. According to v. 14, "all shall serve him." The verb פלח "serve" can also have connotations of liturgical service or worship (as עבד may have in 4Q521 1 ii 3). This verb in Daniel 7:14 may explain the later worship of the Son of Man in the Similitudes of Enoch (1 Enoch 48:5; 62:6–9).[12]

The Hasmoneans as precursors of the messianic age

Messianic hopes were connected to the restoration of the Judean state by the hand of the Hasmoneans, "those to whom the deliverance of Israel had been entrusted' (1 Macc. 5:62).[13] Two poems honoring Judah and Simon after their

10. Noth 1928. Noth has been followed by Weimar 1975; Müller 1975; Steck 1980: 55. Müller's understanding of the Son of Man as guardian angel for the eschatological Israel can be compared with options 2 and 3 above. For Noth, the Similitudes knew only these verses from Dan. 7:9–10.13 and preserve the original image of the Son of Man as a universal messiah and judge, different from the full version of Daniel 7 that makes the Son of Man a symbol of the Kingdom of God.

11. The same idea recurs in Matt. 19:28 (cf. 28:18–20); 22:30; Rev. 2:26–28; 3:21; 4:4; 20:4–6. These NT writings share the idea of enthronement and reign both for the messiah and his people that I find in Daniel 7 and 4Q521.

12. *Pace* Noth 1928: 149, who argued that the Similitudes knew and used Dan. 7:9–11, 13, but not v. 14. It seems artificial to separate v. 14 from v. 13. Without v. 14 it is not clear that the Son of Man is awarded kingdom and reign.

13. An echo of 2 Sam. 2:18, where deliverance is entrusted to David (Goldstein 1987: 80).

deaths, 1 Maccabeas 3:3–9; 14:4–15, contain a number of echoes of biblical texts on the son of David and the future Davidic kingdom. Here these priestly rulers were hailed as small messiahs, bringing to a preliminary fulfilment Davidic messianic prophecies from the Bible.[14] Such a realized eschatology does not exclude a more comprehensive future fulfillment of the prophecies: compare the conditional clause about Simon and his descendants as priests and leaders "until a true prophet arises" (1 Macc. 14:41). The Hasmonean reign was probably seen as a nucleus of an awaited messianic kingdom, similar to the self-understanding of orthodox Jewish settlers in the West Bank today. 1 Maccabees was written around 100 BC, but these two laudatory poems probably existed before their present prosaic literary context. The poem on Judah could have been phrased as early as the time of Jonathan. Thus, Hasmonean reign was connected to Davidic texts also before Aristobulus I and Janneus took the title of king.

1 Maccabees repeatedly uses the term "Judah and his brothers" (1 Macc. 3:25.42; 4:36.59; 5:10.61.63.65; 7:6.10.27; cf.1 Macc. 8:20; 2 Macc. 2:19 "Judah the Maccabee and his brothers"). This phrase consciously recalls the same term in Genesis (37:26; 38:1; 44:14, cf. 1 Chron. 5:2) and alludes to the patriarch Judah as leader of "Israel." This is another indication that the Hasmoneans incorporated Davidic prerogatives.

From Jonathan onwards the Hasmonean rulers occupied the double office of civil leader (from 104: king) and high priest. Psalms 110 with its priestly Son of David would be a natural reference text for the supporters of the Hasmoneans. When the eulogy of Simon praises him for "crushing the power of the kings" (1 Macc. 14:13), this could echo Ps 110:5–6: "He (God) will strike kings on the day of his wrath … he (the king) will strike leaders throughout the land." And when Judah "brought bitterness to many a king" (1 Macc. 3:7), the eulogy alludes to royal psalms such as Psalms 2:1–4, 10–12; 110:1–2, 5–7. Thus, messianic hopes, priestly and Davidic, would be connected to the Hasmoneans and their restoration of the Judean state (cf. Goldstein 1987: 74–81).

14. Key words recur from Gen. 49:9; 1 Sam. 17:5, 34–9; 1 Kgs 5:3-5; 8:13; Isa. 11:4; Mic. 4:4; 5:3-5; Zech. 9:10; Ps. 2:10; 45:18; 72:4.17–19. On Juda: "he put on the breastplate like a giant and girded on his war harness," "he was like a lion," "his memory is blessed for ever and ever," "his name resounded to the ends of the earth." On Simon: "he gained access to the islands of the sea," "they farmed their land in peace," "each man sat under his own vine and fig tree," "his fame resounded to the ends of the earth," "he established peace in the land," "no enemy was left in the land to fight them, the kings in those days were crushed," "he gave strength to all the humble," "gave new splendour to the temple" (translation *Jerusalem Bible*). These two poems are not discussed by Oegema, who states: "From the Maccabeans no messianic expectations have been handed down to us" (Oegema 1998: 73). But cf. the following comments: "the abundant echoes of prophecies in the poem here are intended to suggest to the Jewish reader that the age of fulfilment of the prophesies of Israel's glory had begun in the years of Simon's rule" (Goldstein 1976: 490); "The rulers thus have some of the glamour of what could be called in a broad sense a fulfilled messianism" (Horbury 2003: 49).

Hyrcanus's and Janneus's territorial expansion of the Judean state would necessarily be seen by many Judeans as signs of the messianic age. The inclusion of the Idumeans and Itureans into the Jewish commonwealth would bring into mind texts such as Isaiah 2:1–4; Zephaniah 3:9. Hyrcanus's razing to the ground of the Samaritans' city Shechem and temple on Gerizim (around 112 BCE: *Ant* 13.254–6, *Wars* 1.62–3) would easily be connected to texts referring to the Son of David's victory over the enemies of God's people. To the *Wirkungsgeschichte* of Hasmonean messianism belongs the contrasting messianism of the *Yahad*, elaborated in an opposition group that sociologically defined its identity as a "small community" in contrast to the temple and the ruling circles as "center".[15]

4Q175 (4QTestimonia) and 4Q378/379 (4QApocryphon of Joshua) describe two evil brothers who rebuild "the city" and fall under Joshua's curse over Jericho (Josh 6). Most scholars connect these texts with Hyrcanus's sons Aristobulus I, Antigonus, and/or Janneus, and "the city" with Hasmonean Jericho (Eshel 1998: 63–89). Milik's suggestion that the brothers are Jonathan and Simon who fortified and rebuilt Jerusalem (1 Macc. 10:10-11; 12:36; 13:52) remains a valid option (Milik 1959: 61–4). Whatever the right interpretation of these two Qumran texts, in biblical perspective rebuilding Jerusalem is more important than Jericho.[16] A rebuilding of the city by a ruler in Jerusalem could be interpreted as a sign of the messianic age, cf. 1 Maccabees 3:3; 14:6.14 (from the poems mentioned above), and again lead to the polemic in 4QTestimonia and the *Apocryphon of Joshua*, sectarian countertexts to Hasmonean claims of "messianic" rebuilding of the Israelite state.

The future hope of 4QTestimonia includes the separate offices of *prophet*, *Davidic ruler*, and *priest*—a critical *Yahad* response to the double office of Hasmonean rulers. 4QTestimonia may be seen as a mirror of the edict of 140 BCE that made Simon and his descendants both high *priest* and *ethnarch* of the Judeans "until a true *prophet* arises" (1 Macc. 14:41, cf. 4:46). Thus, 1 Maccabees 14:41 recognizes the three offices of prophet, priest, and civil ruler. Two of them are already functioning, while the prophet is postponed to the future. Slightly in contrast, a source preserved by Josephus saw Hyrcanus "accounted by God worthy of three of the greatest privileges; the rule of the nation, the office of high priest, and the gift of prophecy" (*Ant.* 13.299–300), and reports a prophetic revelation given to Hyrcanus in the temple during his priestly service (*Ant.* 13.282–3).

The *Prayer for King Jonathan* in 4Q448 testifies to messianic connotations connected to the Hasmonean kingdom. The "God with us and the king" theme that penetrates this prayer echoes royal psalms in the Psalter. The term ממלכה is used both on God's kingdom in the first stanza and on Jonathan's kingdom in

15. Schofield 2009: 47–51, 274–5. Oegema states: "There might be an analogy between the Hasmonean priest-kings and the [Qumran] eschatological 'Messiahs from Aaron and Israel'" (Oegema 1998: 100).

16. Architectural features of the Hasmonean temple were preserved in Herod's temple. The eastern balustrade, the colonnade of Solomon, belongs to this stratum (Ådna 1999: 4–31).

the second. Janneus's wars and territorial expansion were seen as fulfillment of biblical promises.

Concluding, there are a number of texts suggesting a restorative messianism in pro-Hasmonean ideology. This messianism represent an eschatology different from the more apocalyptic eschatology shared by other circles in second century Judea.

A reedemed people without a Davidic messiah

At the same time there are second-century texts that testify to the hope of a redeemed people centered around the temple and temple city without mention of a Davidic messiah. The Zion hymns of Sirach 36, Tobit 13, and 11QapostrZion represent such a hope. When Sir 36 is read together with the laudation of the high priest Simon (Ch. 50) and Phinehas and his zeal (Sir. 45:23, Num. 25:7–11), a central role for the high priest in Jerusalem of the end-times must be in the horizon. [17] The same is true for the concluding Zion hymn in the contemporary book of Tobit (Tobit 13.8-18).[18] *Jubilees* is another priestly text that looks forward to a renewal of the people without any royal messiah (cf. *Jub* 1:28–9; 23:26–31).

Also 4Q246 II looks forward to the renewed people of God without mentioning a messianic ruler. With Justnes I see the "son of God" in I 7–II 1 as a rebellious ruler, and the people of God as the collective subject of salvation in II 4–9 (Justnes 2007: 137–62). If Noth was right separating the poetic vision in Daniel 7:9–11.13 from the four kingdoms vision in Daniel 7, the original core of Daniel 7 described the trials and restoration of God's people without any messianic leader or redemptive figure.

Bibliography

Ådna, Jostein (1999), *Jerusalemer Tempel und Tempelmarkt im 1. Jahrhundert n. Chr.* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz).

Becker, Michael (2007), "Die 'messianische Apokalypse' 4Q521 und der Interpretationsrahmen der Taten Jesu," in J. Frey and M. Becker (eds), *Apokalyptik und Qumran* (Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2007), 264–6.

17. Ben Sira portrays the high priest Simon as civil leader of the people, 50:1–4 (cf. Horbury 2003: 43–50). Sir. 45:24-26 makes the covenant with Aaron greater than that with David. The Hebrew version of v. 25 limits the Davidic promise to Solomon, while the covenant with Aaron is lasting: "And there is also a covenant with David, son of Isai, from the tribe of Judah; the inheritance of a man [i.e. David] is to his son alone, the inheritance of Aaron is also to his seed" (Ms. B, translation Horbury).

18. While Tobit likely has an Eastern Diaspora background, the added Zion hymn with its address *to Zion* represents a *novum* in Hebrew psalmody, originating in Judea or Jerusalem (Elgvin and Hallermayer 2006: 460).

Collins, John J. (1993), *Daniel. A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Minneapolis, Fortress).
Elgvin, Torleif and Michaela Hallermayer (2006), "Schøyen ms. 5234: Ein neues Tobit-Fragment vom Toten Meer," *RevQumran* 22: 451–61.
Elgvin, Torleif (2012), "Notes on the Gabriel Inscription," *Semitica* 54: 221–32.
Eshel, Hanan (1998), *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hasmonean State* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).
Gese, Hartmut (1977), "Der Messias," *Zur Biblischen Theologie. Alttestamentliche Vorträge* (München: Kaiser), 128–51.
Goldstein, Jonathan A. (1976), *I Maccabees. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New York: Doubleday).
Goldstein, Jonathan A. (1987), "How the Authors of 1 and 2 Maccabees Treated the 'Messianic' Promises," in J. Neusner et al. (eds), *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 97–109.
Horbury, William (2003), *Messianism Among Jews and Christians. Biblical and Historical Studies* (London: T&T Clark).
Hultgren, Stephen (2008), "4Q521, the Second Benediction of the *Tefillah*, the *hasidim*, and the Development of Royal Messianism," *RevQumran* 91: 313–40.
Justnes, Årstein (2009), *The Time of Salvation. An Analysis of 4QApocryphon of Daniel ar (4Q246), 4QMessianic Apocalypse (4Q521 2), and 4QTime of Righteousness (4Q215a)* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang).
Milik, Josef T. (1959), *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea* (London: SCM Press).
Müller, K. (1975), "Der Menschensohn im Danielsyklus," in R. Pesch and R. Schnackenburg (eds), *Jesus und der Menschensohn* (Freiburg; Herder), 37–80.
Nickelsburg, George W. E. and James C. VanderKam (2011), *1 Enoch 2. A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 37–82* (Minneapolis: Fortress).
Niebuhr, Karl-Wilhelm (1998), "4Q521,2 II – Ein eschatologischer Psalm," in Z. J. Kapera (ed.), *Mogilany 1995: Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls Offered in Memory of Aleksy Klawek* (Krakow: Enigma Press), 151–68.
Noth, Martin (1926), "Zur Komposition des Buches Daniel," *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 98/99: 143–63.
Novakovic, Lidija (2007), "4Q521: The Works of the Messiah or the Signs of the Messianic Time?" in M. T. Davis and B. A. Strawn (eds), *Qumran Studies: New Approaches, New Questions* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans), 208–31.
Oegema, Gerbern (1998), The Anointed and his People. Messianic Expectations from the Maccabees to Bar Kochba (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
Orlov, Andrei (2004), "The Heavenly Counterpart of the Visionary in the Slavonic Ladder of Jacob," in C. A. Evans (ed.), *Of Scribes and Sages* (LSTS 51; London: T&T Clark), 59–76.
Orlov, Andrei (2007), "Moses' Heavenly Counterpart in the Book of Jubilees," *Biblica*, 88: 153–73.
Puech, Émile (1998), "521. 4QApocalypse messianique," *DJD*, 25: 1–38.
Puech, Émile (1999), "Some Remarks on 4Q246 and 4Q521 and Qumran Messianism," in D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich (eds), *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill), 545–65.
Schofield, Alison (2009), *From Qumran to the Yahad. A New Paradigm of Textual Development for the Community Rule* (STDJ 77; Leiden: Brill).

Sjöberg, Erik (1946), *Der Menschensohn im äthiopischen Henochbuch* (Lund: Gleerup).
Steck, Odil H. (1980), "Weltgeshehen und Gottesvolk im Buche Daniel," in D. Lührmann and G. Strecker (eds), *Kirche* (FS G. Bornkamm; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck), 53–78.
Sæbø, Magne (1978), "Von Grossreich zum Weltreich. Erwägungen zu Pss. lxxii 8, lxxxix 26; Sach. ix 10b," *VT*, 28: 83–91.
Tov, Emanuel (2004), *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (Leiden: Brill).
Weimar, P. (1975), "Daniel 7: Eine Textanalyse," in R. Pesch and R. Schnackenburg (eds), *Jesus und der Menschensohn* (Freiburg; Herder), 11–36.

Response to Elgvin

Joseph L. Angel

Torleif Elgvin's learned paper consists of a number of micro-theses, which, when taken together, point toward a provocative macro-account of the development of messianism in the Hasmonean period. The broad argument runs as follows. Messianic texts from before and during the Maccabean era exhibit a pattern that may be related to the shifting political circumstances of the time. Pre-Maccabean messianic hopes do not envision the reconstitution on earth of an ideal kingdom under a Davidic messiah. Instead, as in Daniel 7:13, this figure is projected into heaven. There are two historical causes behind this transformation of the biblical promise. First, the reality of the overwhelming power of the Hellenistic kingdoms removed the hope for renewal of Davidic rule from the horizon. Second, since Jerusalem was ruled by an anointed priest, there was no real need for an anointed king. The latter circumstance especially lies behind the numerous portraits of a redeemed people centered around the temple city without mention of a messiah. Maccabean period texts, namely the final version of Daniel 7 and 4Q521, display a further development, whereby the notion of the earthly people of God as messianic subject is combined with the image of the heavenly Davidic messiah, who becomes "the guarantee for the end-time rule of the people of God on earth." For Elgvin, both of these texts derive from contexts at some distance from the Hasmoneans since they favor the Davidic model and do not mention earthly rulers. Contemporary texts supportive of Maccabean rule (e.g. 1 Macc. 3:3-9; 14:4-15) exploit Davidic imagery in order to paint the Hasmoneans as the fulfillment of biblical promises of redemption.

Before engaging some of his particular arguments, a few comments on the broad brush strokes are in order. Elgvin is to be commended for his wide-ranging efforts to relate a diverse spectrum of messianic texts to the complex historical and social settings of the Seleucid and Hasmonean periods. His paper opens up many interesting and potentially fruitful avenues of discussion. At the same time, it is important to remain cognizant of the inherent pitfalls in such a historicizing approach. We must acknowledge the uncertain nature of speculation regarding the types of messianic beliefs that are most appropriate to certain political settings. Besides being ambiguous—Daniel 7 and 4Q521, for example, never identify their redeeming figures clearly and never refer to David explicitly—these texts are imaginative and idealized expressions of dynamic and complex individuals and communities about which we know precious little. The diversity of messianic beliefs found in the sectarian corpus of Qumran, which resists coherent systematization, should serve as an appropriate caution against the precise correlation of certain types of messianic belief to particular social settings. An additional intersecting problem arises from the favoring of external historical factors for explaining the particular contours of these texts, namely that it tends to be reductive of the equally foundational facings of these texts as internal unfoldings of scriptural hermeneutics and as performative rhetoric that both reflects and

fosters the formation of communal identity. As the work of Steven Fraade has shown, these three textual facings—historical, hermeneutical, and rhetorical—are complexly intertwined, and the abstraction of one without due consideration of the others risks underplaying the dynamic dialogical complexity inhering in ancient Jewish texts (Fraade 2011).

Elgvin's paper invites a whole range of detailed comments. I will focus upon the author's contention that the messianic vision of 4Q521 is dependent on that of Daniel 7, and that both texts espouse the same eschatological scenario in which the enthronement of a Davidic messiah in heaven coincides with the eschatological rule of God's people on earth. Elgvin is correct to note the presence in each text of an individual redeemer and a redeemed collective that is given sovereignty, but there are important differences that should not be minimized. In Daniel 7 the symmetry between the celestial בר אנש and the terrestrial people is clear. The heavenly enthronement of the former parallels the earthly rise to power of the latter. In 4Q521, however, the report that the heavens and earth will listen to the messiah is not enough, in my opinion, to identify him as heavenly (cf. Deut. 32:1, where the heavens and earth are beckoned to listen to the earthly Moses). The fact that the heavens and the earth are to listen to him appears to be symbolic of this figure's cosmic power and perhaps his ability to usher in miracles on earth. Moreover, whereas the political renewal of the people is central to Daniel 7, in 4Q521 political exaltation is but one of many wondrous eschatological events. In fact, rather than following Daniel 7, the report in 4Q521 2 ii 7 that "he will honor the Hasidim on the throne of an eternal kingdom" appears to be an exegesis of the Song of Hannah, according to which God will favor "his Hasidim," and grant the poor a "throne of honor" (1 Sam. 2:8-10). The fact that many other phrases and concepts in the Song of Hannah overlap with 4Q521, such as YHWH's acts of feeding the hungry, killing and bringing to life, casting down into Sheol and raising up, and exalting the horn of "his messiah," supports this suggestion (cf. Hultgren 2009). The use of other scriptural passages, such as Malachi 3:24 and especially Isaiah 61 and Psalm 146 (Elgvin mentions the latter) should be drawn into the discussion of the precise messianic orientation of this text as well.

Finally, while it is possible to see the messiah of 4Q521 as Davidic,[1] this is more difficult with respect to the בר אנש in Daniel 7. Indeed there is no mention of David and no overt interest in the Davidic monarchy in the entire book. (It is telling that when Daniel does mention the word משיח in 9:26 it is likely in reference to the murdered high priest Onias III.) Elgvin rightly recognizes the notion of *Weltreich* in this chapter, but this need not be seen strictly in light of the expansion of Davidic rule from *Grossreich* to *Weltreich* that develops in the Bible. I would like to suggest the alternative that this aspect of Daniel is to be seen against the backdrop of the theological shift from the early conception of YHWH as bound to the borders of Israel, as articulated in Deuteronomy 32, to the conception of

1. Scholars have also argued for either a priestly or a prophetic messiah in 4Q521. For a summary of the main lines of reasoning behind the three scholarly approaches, see Novakovic 2007: 208–31, esp. 214–16.

the God of Israel as the universal אלהא דשמיא so common in the Second Temple period. Indeed, the portrait of the *Urzeit* in Deuteronomy 32 of Elyon distributing peoples and lands to subordinate deities, including YHWH, who receives Israel as his inheritance, more readily recommends itself as the backdrop to Daniel 7, which also envisions a chief deity bestowing earthly dominion to subordinate divine beings.[2] The difference is that here, in the *Endzeit*, the land is redistributed, not as a number of great kingdoms but rather as one eternal *Weltreich* possessed by the one like a human being, who is the end-time counterpart to YHWH in Deuteronomy 32.[3]

Bibliography

Fraade, S. (2011), *Legal Fictions: Studies of Law and Narrative in the Discursive Worlds of Ancient Jewish Sectarians and Sages* (JSJSup 147; Leiden: Brill).

Hultgren, S. (2009), "4Q521 and Luke's 'Magnificat' and 'Benedictus,'" in F. García Martínez (ed.), *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament* (STDJ 85; Leiden: Brill), 119–32.

Novakovic, L. (2007), "4Q521: The Works of the Messiah or the Signs of the Messianic Time?" in M. T. Davis and B. A. Strawn (eds), *Qumran Studies: New Approaches, New Questions* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans), 208–31.

2. Here I follow the suggestion of Michael Segal put forward in an unpublished essay entitled "Reconsidering the Theological Background of Daniel 7 and 4Q246 in Light of Innerbiblical Interpretation." I thank Dr. Segal for sharing his work with me.

3. In this connection it is interesting to note Segal's observation (appearing in the above-mentioned essay) that the language of eternal dominion and kingship attributed to the בר אנש in Dan. 7:14 (e.g. שלטנה שלטן עלם and ומלכותה די לא תתחבל) is paralleled by the language attributed to the God of Israel in the doxologies of Dan. 3:31-33; 4:31; and 6:26-27.

4

4QApocryphon of Daniel ar (4Q246) and the Book of Daniel

Årstein Justnes[1]

4QApocryphon of Daniel ar (4Q246) is a rather famous text from Qumran with a storied recent past, thanks to the parallels between 4Q246 2:1 and Luke 1:32, 35.[2] However, despite its "official name," Apocryphon of Daniel ar,[3] 4Q246 has to some extent been living in the shadow of other Danielic texts from Qumran such as 4QPrayer of Nabonidus ar (4Q242) and 4QPseudo-Daniel[a,b,c] (4Q243–245).[4] The rather low level of interest in 4Q246 as a Danielic text seems mainly due to the simple (and convenient) fact that it contains no mention of the name "Daniel."[5]

Over the past twenty years there has been a growing tendency among the most influential interpreters of 4Q246 to relate the restorations of the fragmentary col. i more closely to the book of Daniel.[6] Nevertheless, the exact relation between the two compositions is still a matter of debate.[7] In this article I shall argue that 4Q246 2 is an adaptation of Daniel 7, and demonstrate how 4Q246 also draws on other parts of Daniel, most notably texts concerning Antiochus Epiphanes IV. In the conclusion I will indicate a dating for 4Q246.

1. I want to thank Joseph L. Angel, Morten Klepp Beckmann, Kipp Davis, and Kristin Heskje for critical response on earlier versions of this study.

2. The debate on 4Q246 is reviewed in Justnes 2009: 32–73.

3. 4Q246 was "officially published" by Émile Puech in *DJD* 22 (Puech 1996: 165–85).

4. Cf. for instance Flint 2001: 329–67, who devotes 28 pages to 4Q242–245, but only half a page to 4Q246.

5. Flint 2001: 361: "This is not a Danielic text since the prophet is never actually named"; Collins 2012: 213: "the association with Daniel is controversial, since the name does not occur in the extant fragments."

6. On the relation between 4Q246 and Daniel, John J. Collins's early articles from 1993 have been particularly important and influential (see Collins 1993c, 1993a).

7. Collins 2001: 4: "Whether this text is dependent on Daniel, or even an interpretation of it, or is an independent composition of a similar type, remains a highly controversial question"; Stuckenbruck 2006: 119: "The overlaps and departures between 4Q246 and Daniel neither exclude nor fully substantiate the notion of a dependence on Daniel."

Short introduction to 4Q246

4Q246 is a small and fragmentary text, difficult to interpret. What remains is a two-columned fragment written in Aramaic, each consisting of nine lines. The first column is torn vertically, with one-third to one-half of each line missing. Column ii is in much better shape, being basically intact.[8]

The original scroll was longer and consisted of at least four sheets. The content of the fragmentary opening lines of col. i strongly suggests that it was preceded by at least one column. Further, the fact that col. ii ends with the construct form תהומי shows that it was originally followed by another column (or more) (Collins 1993c: 66).

The script is Herodian, and the ms. was palaeographically assigned by Josef T. Milik to the last third of the first century BCE (Puech 1996: 166). Émile Puech is even more specific: "La graphie se placerait assez bien, semble-t-il, entre 4QSam[a] ou 1QIs[b] et 1QM par exemple, de préférence *ca* 25 av. J.-C." (Puech 1996: 166).

The Text

Col. i

1 [ ] settled [u]pon him. He fell before the throne
2 [ ]the eternal [k]ing. Wrath is approaching and your teeth
3 [ ]… your vision, and everything that shall come forever.
4 [ ]wars; oppression shall come over the earth
5 [ ]and great slaughter in the provinces
6 [ ]kings of Assyria [and E]gypt
7 [ ] will be great over the earth
8 [ ]they [will] do, and they will … everything
9 [ ]the [G]reat will he call himself and by his name he shall designate himself.

Col. ii

1. He shall name himself son of God, and they shall call him son of the Most High. Like the meteors
2. that you saw, so shall their rule be transient: they shall rule over
3. the earth and trample everything down: people shall trample down people, and province shall trample down [pro]vince,
4. (*Vacat*) until the people of God shall rise and make everything rest from the sword. (*Vacat*)
5. Their kingdom shall be an everlasting kingdom and all their paths in truth. They shall jud[ge]
6. the earth in truth and make everything whole. The sword shall cease from the earth,
7. and all the provinces shall pay them homage. The great God is their strength;
8. he himself shall wage war for them. He shall give peoples in their hand and

8. Part of my description here is based on Collins 1993c: 66.

9. cast them all down before them. Their dominion shall be an everlasting dominion, and all the deeps of

4Q246 and Daniel in comparison

The two *vacats* in 4Q246 2:4 seem to separate the text into two different sections that deal with the times of trial and the time of salvation respectively.[9] 4Q246 2:4 marks a turning point in the text with the rise of the people of God. Parts of 1:4–2:3 are comparable to the description of the last heathen world power in Daniel 7 (cf. the fourth animal and the little horn, vv. 17–25), and the description of the time of salvation in 2:4–9 seems to draw substantially on Dan. 7:14, 18, 22, 26–27.

Since the first half of 4Q246 is so fragmentary, I will compare the two compositions by reading 4Q246 backwards. In the following section, I will compare three different parts of 4Q246 with various *pericopae* from Daniel.

(a) 4Q246 2:4–9 and Dan. 7:14–27

The similarities between 4Q246 2:4–9 and Dan. 7:14–27 are striking,[10] see the comparison below:

4Q246 2:4–9	*Daniel 7*
[4] (*vacat*) עד יקום עם אל (*vacat*) וכלא יניח מן חרב	Cf. v. 22 and v. 27
[5] מלכותה מלכות עלם וכל ארחתה בקשוט	מַלְכוּתֵהּ מַלְכוּת עָלַם (v. 27; cf. 4:3)
ידי[ן] [6] ארעא בקשט וכלא יעבד שלם חרב מן ארעא יסף	Cf. v. 22
[7] וכל מדינתא לה יסגדון אל רבא באילה	וְכֹל שָׁלְטָנַיָּא לֵהּ יִפְלְחוּן וְיִשְׁתַּמְּעוּן (v. 27; cf. also v. 14)
[8] הוא יעבד לה קרב עממין ינתן בידה	וְקַרְנָא דִכֵּן עָבְדָה קְרָב עִם־קַדִּישִׁין (v. 21) וְיִתְיַהֲבוּן בִּידֵהּ (v. 25)
וכלהן [9] ירמה קדמוהי שלטנה שלטן עלם וכל תהומי	שָׁלְטָנֵהּ שָׁלְטָן עָלַם (v. 14; cf. 4:31)

9. Flusser (1980: 32–3) was the first to interpret the *vacat* at the beginning of 2:4 as a marker of the turning point in the text. He held that everything preceding this *vacat* described the wicked rule of the last empire of the heathen and "the leader of this horrible kingdom," the Son of God.

10. Cf. Stökl Ben Ezra 2010: 537: "4Q246 is the only Qumran text with extensive parallels to Daniel 7."

[4] (*Vacat*) until the people of God shall rise and make everything rest from the sword.	Cf. v. 22 and v. 27
(*Vacat*) [5] Their kingdom shall be an everlasting kingdom and all their paths in truth.	Their kingdom shall be an everlasting kingdom (v. 27; cf. 4:3)
They shall jud[ge] [6] the earth in truth and make everything whole.	Cf. v. 22
The sword shall cease from the earth, [7] and all the provinces shall pay them homage.	and all dominions shall serve and obey them (v. 27; cf. also v. 14).
The great God is their strength; [8] he himself shall wage war for them.	this horn made war with the holy ones (v. 21)
He shall give peoples in their hand and [9] cast them all down before them.	and they shall be given into his power (v. 25)
Their dominion shall be an everlasting dominion, and all the deeps of	His dominion is an everlasting dominion (v. 14; cf. 4:31)

As the comparison shows, the description of the time of salvation in 4Q246 2:4–9 not only draws substantially on resources from Daniel 7,[11] but also develops Daniel's depiction of the ultimate hope. The description in 4Q246 2:4–9 is both richer and longer than the description of the hope in Daniel 7. More specifically, 4Q246 2:4–9 elaborates on the sayings about the kingdom and the dominion of the people of God in Dan. 7:27 and 7:14, and depicts the rule of the people of God (4Q246 2:7b–8) in contrast to the description of the ungodly rule of Antiochus in Dan. 7:21 and 7:25.[12] In Dan. 7:22 we find a temporal use of עד similar to that in 4Q246 2:4, and in both texts this term marks a turning point (cf. "until the Ancient One came"). Note also the judgement motif in both texts (4Q246 2:5; Dan. 7:22, 26).

If we ask more specifically what the core of the expectation in 4Q246 is, we are in essence left with the very elements that the author draws from Daniel 7—in other words, the expectation of the kingdom of the people of God and of their dominion over hostile powers (4Q246 2:7, 9). Of particular importance here is Dan. 7:27, which basically consists of three elements: (1) "The people

11. Cf. Collins (1997a: 18), who says that the parallels to Daniel in 4Q246 2:3, 5 and 9 "give rise to the suspicion that 4Q246 may be an adaptation of Daniel 7, although it is certainly not a systematic interpretation." See also p. 85: "There is … reason to consider the possibility that the Son of God text is a reinterpretation of Daniel 7." Stuckenbruck (2006: 119) is more hesitant: "Even if the vision of Daniel 7 has provided some written or oral background for the Cave 4 text … individual elements have been used rather freely … It is therefore difficult … to imagine how 4Q246 could be an interpretation of Daniel as a 'biblical' book."

12. In Daniel 7 both the vision itself and its interpretation concentrate on the fourth animal (vv. 19–25). The interpretation says next to nothing concerning the first three animals. Note that Rev 13:7 (καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ποιῆσαι πόλεμον μετὰ τῶν ἁγίων) also alludes to Dan. 7:21; see also Rev. 11:7.

of the holy ones of the Most High" is given "The kingship and dominion and the greatness of the kingdoms under the whole heaven"; (2) their kingdom is characterized as an "everlasting kingdom" (cf. also Dan. 7:18); and (3) the people receive full submission from every enemy ("all dominions shall serve and obey them"). Whereas Daniel 7 shows no interest in the nature of the kingdom and the character of its reign (Collins 1997b: 83), 4Q246 is richer concerning these points: 2:4b describes the effect of the people of God entering the stage, and 2:5b–7a describes their rule. 2:7b–9a focuses on the role of God: He shall wage war for the people of God and give the peoples in their hand.[13]

The several lexical congruencies reviewed above should also draw our attention to places where there are differences: It is interesting that 4Q246 2:4 speaks of "the people of God" (עם אל; only known elsewhere from 1QM 1:5; 3:13), whereas Daniel 7 has "the people of the holy ones of the Most High" (עַם קַדִּישֵׁי עֶלְיוֹנִין; 7:27, cf. also קַדִּישֵׁי עֶלְיוֹנִין in 7:18, 22, 25).

(b) 4Q246 2:1c–3 and Dan. 7:23/Dan. 2:39–40

The trials leading up to the time of salvation in 4Q246 are described in language that resembles Dan. 7:23 and Dan. 2:39–40. Cf. the two comparisons below:

4Q246 2:1c–3	*Dan 7:23*
Like the meteors [2] that you saw,	This is what he said: "As for the fourth beast,
so shall their rule (מלכותהן)	there shall be a fourth kingdom (מַלְכוּ) on earth
be transient (שני[א])[14]:	that shall be different from (תִּשְׁנָא מִן) all the other kingdoms;
they shall rule over [3] the earth (על ארעא)	it shall devour (וְתֵאכֹל) the whole earth (כָּל־אַרְעָא),
and trample everything down (וכלא ידשון)	and trample it down (וּתְדוּשִׁנַּהּ),[15] and break it to pieces (וְתֵדֵקִנַּהּ).

Like the rulers in 4Q246 2:2–3, the fourth animal in Daniel represents a total and destructive rule.[16] Moreover, in both texts the dominions are to a considerable degree described with the same roots, שנא and דוש.[17] It should further be noted that the Son of God figure in 2:1 is linked to the lines reviewed above, 4Q246 2:2–3, very much as the little horn is linked to the fourth kingdom in Daniel 7. And, just like the little horn in Daniel 7, the son of God in 4Q246 is given much more attention than other figures mentioned in the text.[18]

13. 4Q246 seems to reflect some of the same apocalyptic quietism of Daniel, cf. Collins 1993b: 72.

14. For a discussion of this reconstruction, see Justnes 2009: 129–31.

15. Cf. also the use of רפס Dan. 7:7, 19.

16. As noted by Stuckenbruck (2006: 118–19), it is the people who trample in 4Q246 2:3, "whereas Daniel 7 ascribes this activity to the fourth beast."

17. Cf. also the prepositional phrase בְּאַרְעָא in 7:23 that is related to על ארעא in 4Q246. The latter phrase also occurs frequently in the part preceding the *vacats* (cf. 1:4, 7).

18. There are several similarities between the Son of God in 4Q246 and the fourth beast

The totality of the rule of the third and the fourth kingdoms is also stressed in Dan. 2:39-40:

4Q246 2:1c–3	*Dan 2:39–40*
Like the meteors [2] that you saw,	Cf. Dan. 2:41, 43, 45
	[39] After you
so shall their rule (מלכותהן) be transient:	shall arise another kingdom (מִלְכוּ אָחֳרִי)
	inferior to yours,
	and yet a third kingdom of bronze,
they shall rule (ימלכון) over [3] the earth	which shall rule (תִּשְׁלַט) over the whole earth
(על ארעא)	(בְּכָל־אַרְעָא).
	[40] And there shall be a fourth kingdom,
	strong as iron;
and trample everything down (וכלא ידשון)	just as iron crushes and smashes everything (כָּלָּא),
	it shall crush and shatter all these (כָּל־אִלֵּין).

As can be seen, the essential vocabulary in these two texts is rather similar; a point that is reinforced by the prominent appearance of כל in each. 4Q246's preference for the rare verb מלך over the more frequent שׁלט should, however, be noted.[19]

The description in 4Q246 2:1c–3 appears more general than the rather detailed descriptions in Dan. 7:23 and 2:39–40, ending in a description of conflict that is reminiscent of other apocalyptic predictions: "people shall trample down people, and province shall trample down [pro]vince" (4Q246 2:3; cf. Isa. 19:2; Mk. 13:6–8; Matt. 24:4–8; Lk. 21:8–11; 4 Ezra 13:31; *Sib. Or.* 3:635–636).

(c) 4Q246 1:1–2:1b and Daniel 7 and 11

The close links between col. ii and Daniel 7 give us good reason to expect traces of Daniel in the fragmentary first column of 4Q246 as well. As already mentioned, 4Q246 seems to have inherited its narrative framework from Daniel (cf. the general setting in col. i), and also the first column reflects some of its essential vocabulary (for instance עד עלמא, 1:3 and Dan. 7:18). We also find a conspicuous (and frequent) use of the root רב ("great") in both texts. The root is used three or four times[20] in 4Q246 1 and extensively in Daniel 7:

4Q246 1

1:5 and great slaughter in the provinces (ונחשירין רב במדניתא)
1:7] will be great over the earth (רב להוה על ארעא [)
1:9 the [Gr]eat (One?) will he call himself (ר]בא יתקרא)

and the little horn in Daniel 7. Both figures play parts in contexts that are not only closely related, but also reflect similar linguistic atmospheres (see Justnes 2009: 94–5, 154–62).

19. The former is used twice in the War Scroll, cf. 1QM 12:3, 16.

20. Four times if we follow the consensus reading ר]ברבין in 1:4.

Daniel 7

> [2] I, Daniel, saw in my vision by night the four winds of heaven stirring up the great sea (לְיַמָּא רַבָּא),[3] and four great beasts (וְאַרְבַּע חֵיוָן רַבְרְבָן) came up out of the sea, different from one another … [7] After this I saw in the visions by night a fourth beast, terrifying and dreadful and exceedingly strong. It had great iron teeth (וְשִׁנַּיִן דִּי־פַרְזֶל לַהּ רְבִיעָיָה) and was devouring, breaking in pieces, and stamping what was left with its feet. It was different from all the beasts that preceded it, and it had ten horns. [8] I was considering the horns, when another horn appeared, a little one coming up among them; to make room for it, three of the earlier horns were plucked up by the roots. There were eyes like human eyes in this horn, and a mouth speaking arrogantly (וּפֻם מְמַלֵּל רַבְרְבָן). … [11] I watched then because of the noise of the arrogant words (מִלַּיָּא רַבְרְבָתָא) that the horn was speaking. And as I watched, the beast was put to death, and its body destroyed and given over to be burned with fire. … [17] As for these four great beasts (אִלֵּין חֵיוָתָא רַבְרְבָתָא), four kings shall arise out of the earth. … [20] and concerning the ten horns that were on its head, and concerning the other horn, which came up and to make room for which three of them fell out – the horn that had eyes and a mouth that spoke arrogantly (וְפֻם מְמַלֵּל רַבְרְבָן), and that seemed greater than the others (רַב מִן־חַבְרָתַהּ).

In both texts רב obviously functions as a negative marker. 4Q246 1 uses רב in order to characterize the trials in 1:5, 7(?), and also links the epithet בא]ר to the son of God in 1:9. In Daniel 7 the root plays a major part in the description of the evil and ungodly forces that oppose God and his people. More specifically, the adjective is linked with the sea (once) and the four beasts (twice), but, above all, the root is linked with the fourth beast/the little horn (six times).[21]

As several scholars have noted, there are also interesting similarities between 4Q246 1:9–2:1 and Dan. 11:36-37.[22] Most notable are the frequent occurrences of reflexive forms, the root גדל/רב, and the term אל (cf. also עם אל in 4Q246 2:4). And like Daniel 7 (and 8), Dan. 11:36-37 also describes Antiochus:

> [36] The king shall act as he pleases. He shall exalt himself (וְיִתְרוֹמֵם) and consider himself greater (וְיִתְגַּדֵּל) than any god (עַל־כָּל־אֵל), and shall speak horrendous things against the God of gods (עַל אֵל אֵלִים). He shall prosper until the period of wrath is completed, for what is determined shall be done. [37] He shall pay no respect to the gods of his ancestors, or to the one beloved by women; he shall pay no respect to any other god, for he shall consider himself greater than all (עַל־כֹּל יִתְגַּדָּל).
>
> Dan. 11:36–37

21. In Daniel 8 we find a related use of the corresponding Hebrew root גדל, again primarily tied to Antiochus/"a little horn" (cf. especially 8:9–11, 25).

22. Several scholars have pointed to the relevance of Dan. 11:36-37 for the understanding of the son of God figure in 4Q246. Cf. for instance Steudel 1996: 512.

[9] […]the [G]reat (בא[ר) will he call himself (יתקרא) and by his name he shall designate himself (יתכנה). [1] He shall name himself son of God (ברה די אל), and they shall call him son of the Most High (בר עליון).[23]

4Q246 1:9–2:1

Summary

The preserved part of 4Q246 might be described as a harmonization or a conflation of different texts from Daniel (Dan. 2:39–40, 7:14–27), most notably descriptions of Antiochus (Dan 7, 11:36–37; cf. also Ch. 8). The description of the time of salvation in 4Q246 2:4–9 appears to be an adaptation of the interpretation of the vision in Daniel 7:15–27, probably on the basis of a new vision (cf. 4Q246 1:3 and 2:1). Despite its closeness to Daniel 7, 4Q246 makes no mention of any of the figures from the vision in Daniel 7:1–14: the beasts, horns, the one like son of man, or the Ancient of Days.[24]

A note on the dating of 4Q246

The rather general character of 4Q246 makes it difficult to place the text in a historical context. The obvious place to start is to link the text to the prophet Daniel, and the milieu behind the book of Daniel (cf. for instance Puech 1996: 214). However, both the use of texts from different parts of Daniel and a number of notable lexical parallels between 4Q246 and 1QM 1,[25] cf. below, seem to point towards a later time:[26]

4Q246	**1QM**
קרבין "wars" (pl. unattested elsewhere) 1:4	קרב ונחשיר חזק ("battle and savage destruction"; 1:9)
נחשירין "slaughter" (pl. unattested elsewhere) 1:5	יתקרבו לנחשיר גדול ("they shall confront each other for great destruction"; 1:10), cf. also 1:13
מלך אתור[ומ]צרין 1:6	Cf. 1:2, 4
עם אל 2:4	עם אל 1:5; 3:13

23. Concerning עליון, cf. Dan. 7:18, 22, 25, 27.

24. Cf. also Stökl Ben Ezra 2010: 530–1, 537. He also speculates whether it is "possible that the author of 4Q246 knew the scene of Daniel 7 without verses 9–10 and 13–14" (537; cf. 538).

25. Cf. for instance Steudel 1996: 517.

26. This is definitely not a sectarian text, although some of the first interpreters suggested that. It reflects a different use of Daniel compared with the sectarian texts. Florentino García Martínez (1992) was the first scholar who really tried to read 4Q246 in a close dialogue with the sectarian material from Qumran and as a part of this corpus. For this reader, his long comparative sequences reaching from pp. 173–8 first and foremost show that 4Q246 simply does not fit in among the sectarian texts.

Interestingly, the War Scroll also contains significant allusions to the book of Daniel (Collins 1993b: 73–4; 2012: 206),[27] and the first column has various terminological echoes of Daniel 11–12[28] (Collins 2012: 206).

In my opinion, most scholars tend to date 4Q246 too early. For example, Frank M. Cross states: "The original composition must go back to the early second century BCE, coeval with the four apocalypses of Daniel (Chapters 7, 8, 9 and 10–12 of the Book of Daniel)" (Cross 2003: 152). Klaus Beyer is more specific and places it "in das Ende der Regierungszeit des Antiochus IV. Epiphanes."[29] I prefer to read 4Q246 as having been composed after the book of Daniel was finished.[30] The result is a beautiful apocalyptic text, with poetic features, and with a global eschatology that is compatible with different times within the Hasmonean period.[31]

Bibliography

Beyer, K. (1994), *Die aramäischen Texte von Toten Meer: samt den Inschriften aus Palästina, dem Testament Levis aus der Kairoer Genisa, der Fastenrolle und den alten talmudischen Zitaten: Aramäistische Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung, Deutung, Grammatik/Wörterbuch, Deutsch-aramäische Wortliste, Register: Ergänzungsband* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Collins, J. J. (1993a), "A Pre-Christian 'Son of God' among the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Bible Review*, 9: 34–8, 57.

27. Cf. Stökl Ben Ezra 2010: 536 n.104: "The most important influences of Daniel on Qumranic literature are found in the War Scroll."

28. Collins 2012: 206: "These include 'violators of the covenant' in 1QM I:2, Kittim (passim), one who will 'go forth in great wrath … to destroy' (1QM I:4), 'no helper for Assyria' (1QM I:6, cf. Dan. 11:42, 45). The time of the battle is a 'time of distress' (1QM I:11–12; Dan. 12:1). The archangel Michael, prince of Israel, who arises in victory in Dan 12:1, is also exalted in 1QM XVII:7."

29. Beyer 1994: 111. So also Cook (Wise, Abegg, and Cook 2005: 346): "The historical background of this text may well be the persecution of the Jews under the Syrian tyrant Antiochus IV in the period 170–164 BCE." Cf. Fabry 1994: 80: "[die Makkabäer/Hasmonäer] versuchten … eine gezielte Eigenpropaganda, wobei sie vor allem den ehemaligen selbsternannten Sonnenkönig Antiochus IV. Epiphanes beständig als Negativbeispiel vorführten. Das hilft uns bei der Datierung … des 'Sohn-Gottes'-Textes 4 Q246."

30. Cf. Collins 1993b: 72: "[4Q246 is] almost certainly influenced by the biblical book"; Collins 2012: 217: "It now seems that 4Q243–244 and 4Q245 are largely independent of the biblical book … A stronger case for dependence can be made in the case of 4Q246 … since we here have phrases that correspond exactly to the language of Daniel. I believe that this text does in fact depend on Daniel."

31. Cf. Fabry 1999: 98: "Ein solcher Text hatte in der Gemeinde von Qumran zu allen Zeiten Hochkonjunktur, wurde er doch nun zum Ausdruck einer bleibenden Opposition gegen die Zustände im hellenisierten und schlie lich auch im romanisierten Jerusalem."

Collins, J. J. (1993b), *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress).
Collins, J. J. (1993c), "The 'Son of God' Text from Qumran," in M. C. de Boer (ed.), *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge* (JSNT; Sheffield: Sheffield University Press), 65–82.
Collins, J. J. (1997a), *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (The Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls; London: Routledge).
Collins, J. J. (1997b), "The Expectation of the End in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in C. A. Evans and P. W. Flint (eds), *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans), 74–90.
Collins, J. J. (2001), "Current Issues in the Study of Daniel," in J. J. Collins and P. W. Flint (eds), *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 83.1; Leiden: Brill), 1–15.
Collins, J. J. (2012), "The Book of Daniel and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in M Dávid et al. (eds), *The Hebrew Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (FRLANT 239; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), 203–17.
Cross, F. M. (2003), "The Structure of the Apocalypse of 'Son of God' (4Q246)," in S. M. Paul et al. (eds), *EMANUEL: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (Leiden, Boston: Brill), 151–8.
Fabry, H.-J. (1994), "Qumran—Judentum—Urchristentum: Fragen und Klärungen," *Heilen: Ärzte, Apotheker, Pflegeberufe, Seelsorger im Gespräch*, 3–4: 72–95.
Fabry, H.-J. (1999), "Die frühjüdische Apokalyptik als Reaktion auf Fremdherrschaft: Zur Funktion von 4Q246," in B. Kollman et al. (eds), *Antikes Judentum und Frühes Christentum: Festschrift für Hartmut Stegemann zum 65. Geburtstag* (BZNW 97; Berlin: de Gruyter), 84–98.
Flint, P. W. (2001), "The Daniel Tradition at Qumran," in J. J. Collins and P. W. Flint (eds), *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 83.1; Leiden: Brill), 329–67.
Flusser, D. (1980), "The Hubris of the Antichrist in a Fragment from Qumran," *Immanuel*, 10: 31–7.
Justnes, Å. (2009), *The Time of Salvation: An Analysis of 4QApocryphon of Daniel ar (4Q246), 4QMessianic Apocalypse (4Q521 2), and 4QTime of Righteousness (4Q215a)* (European University Studies 893; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang).
Martínez, F. G. (1992), "The Eschatological Figure of 4Q246," in *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (STDJ 9; Leiden: Brill), 162–79.
Puech, É. (1996), "4QApocryphe de Daniel ar," in G. Brooke et al. (eds), *Qumran Cave 4 XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXII; Oxford: Clarendon), 165–84.
Steudel, A. (1996), "The Eternal Reign of the People of God: Collective Expectations in Qumran Texts (4Q246 and 1QM)," *Revue de Qumran* 65–68: 507–25.
Stuckenbruck, L. (2006), "The Formation and Re-formation of Daniel in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in J. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Bible and The Dead Sea Scrolls, Volume One: Scripture and Scrolls* (The Second Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins; Waco, TX: Baylor University Press), 101–30.
Stökl Ben Ezra, D. (2010), "Messianic Figures in the Aramaic Texts from Qumran," in K. Berthelot and D. Stökl Ben Ezra (eds), *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran at Aix en Provence 30 June – 2 July 2008* (STDJ 94; Leiden: Brill), 514–44.
Wise, M. O., M. G. Abegg and E. M. Cook (2005), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco).

Response to Justnes

Joseph L. Angel

In his stimulating paper, Årstein Justnes seeks to demonstrate that the so-called "Son of God" text from Qumran (4Q246) directly depends upon and partially rewrites Daniel in order to craft "a beautiful apocalyptic text … compatible with different times in the Hasmonean period." Since 4Q246 was most likely copied at the end of the first century BCE, the author's suggestion is well within the realm of possibility.[1] However, given the undetermined date of the *composition* of 4Q246 and the incomplete state of the manuscript, we may question whether the evidence can bear the weight of such a strong conclusion.

Justnes's argument is built upon a comparison of the language and themes of 4Q246 with those of Daniel, particularly the second half of Daniel 7. The author observes numerous characteristics shared by the two texts, including a narrative framework in which a visionary explains the meaning of a king's vision, a fundamental interest in the eschatological inheritance of eternal sovereignty by God's people, and a number of close linguistic connections, the most impressive of which are the appearance in both texts of the phrases מלכותה מלכות עלם (4Q246 2:5 and Dan. 7:27) and שלטנה שלטן עלם (4Q246 2:9 and Dan 7:14), as well as the use of the root דוש to refer to the oppressive acts of human empires (4Q246 2:3 and Dan. 7:23).

Justnes views such links as indicating the dependency of 4Q246 on Daniel, but is this conclusion warranted by the evidence? In my opinion, we cannot exclude the possibility, for example, that each text represents an independent expression of a particular mode of political thinking that emerged in response to the pressures of Hellenistic rule (cf. Puech 1992). Alternatively, is it possible to understand the combination of linguistic overlaps and differences and the mostly non-parallel combination of words as independent iterations of a common apocalyptic tradition?

If, however, we accept the assertion of literary dependency, why should Daniel 7 automatically be deemed the earlier text? [2] Justnes is correct that the isolated passage of 4Q246 2:4–9 provides a richer and lengthier description of the eschatological dominion of the people of God than does Daniel 7, but this does not ensure that 4Q246 is the more developed, and hence, presumably, later text. Indeed, as Justnes himself points out, even as column ii seems to elaborate on the expectations of Daniel, it at the same time "appears more general than the rather detailed descriptions in Daniel 7:23 and 2:39-40." This opens up for consideration the possibility that it is rather Daniel 7, which, according to most scholarly accounts, draws upon numerous and diverse earlier sources, that has excerpted

1. The earliest Qumran manuscripts of Daniel (4Q114, 4Q116) have been dated to the end of the second century BCE. See *DJD* 39: 384.

2. E. Cook (1995: 44) locates the Aramaic of 4Q246 "almost anywhere in a typological series from Daniel to the Genesis Apocryphon."

and transformed the poetically unified account of 4Q246 in service of its own particular contextual literary concerns.

Leaving aside the above comments, if we are to accept both the claim of literary dependence and the direction of influence suggested by Justnes, we might seek to discover some sort of programmatic purpose behind the supposed reworking as a means for refining our understanding of the relationship between the two texts. Can the combination of overlaps with and departures from Daniel in 4Q246 add up to such a discernible purpose? Only a thorough and reasoned analysis of both similarities and divergences, both textual and contextual, as well as due consideration of other possibly related sources (such as, for example, the Uruk prophecy) could potentially yield such an answer. While putting these two texts in dialogue with one another in such a manner surely generates some very interesting possibilities, reading with a priori assumptions about their relationship exposes us to the perpetual danger of distortion and over-reading. So, for example, when 2:8 states that "He will wage war for him/them; He will give peoples into his/their hand," is this really to be taken as an intentional reversal of the ungodly rule of Antiochus mentioned in Daniel 7:21 and 25? This is certainly possible, as the language and themes are similar. In the Qumran text, God wages war and subdues the nations eternally, while in Daniel it is Antiochus who wages war and subdues the holy ones temporarily. But the syntax and vocabulary are not identical (ויתיהבון בידה vs. ינתן בידה), and it is just as likely in my view that common Aramaic terminology of eschatological warfare is being utilized independently. Compare, for example, ויתיהבון בידהון in the *Apocalypse of Weeks* represented in 4Q212, which refers to the giving over of the wicked into the hands of the righteous in the eighth week. Interestingly, this particular Enochic fragment shares several lexical items with 4Q246 as well: לארח קשוט (cf. וכל ארחתה בקשוט; 4Q246 2:5), דין קשוט (cf. ארעא ידין בקשט; 2:5-6), וירמון (cf. ירמה; 2:9), [חרב] (cf. חרב; 2:6), בקשט (cf. 2:6), עלמא (cf. 2:5, 9), and many comparable totalizing uses of the word כול.

Finally, I would like to comment on the tendency to locate 4Q246 within a "Danielic" social milieu. While there is clearly some relationship between 4Q246 and Daniel, we may actually lose more than we gain from such a classification. The text perhaps exhibits the same "quietism"[3] as Daniel, but other elements commonly considered typical of the latter, such as the intensive interest in the angels and the goings on of the heavenly world, are absent. We do not know the identity of the visionary. Moreover, in light of evidence such as the pseudo-Daniel texts and the shared divine courtroom tradition in Daniel 7 and the Qumran *Book of Giants*, which in my opinion exhibits a fluid process of cross-fertilization between traditions associated with both Daniel and Enoch (cf. Stuckenbruck 2001), we should be wary of positing too rigid of a connection between apocalyptic traditions and clearly distinguishable social contexts, especially in this case where much of the original text is missing. The author of 4Q246 could very well

3. For a recent critique of the common use of this term to describe the outlook of the book of Daniel, see Portier-Young 2011: 264–5 and n. 164.

have possessed knowledge of or been influenced by Daniel, but strictly tying him to a Danielic social milieu would be unnecessarily confining.

Bibliography

Cook, E. (1995), "4Q246," Bulletin for Biblical Research, 5: 43–66.

Portier-Young, A. (2011), *Apocalypse against Empire: Theologies of Resistance in Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).

Puech, É. (1992), "Fragment d'une Apocalypse en Araméen (4Q246 – pseudo-Dan^{d} et le 'Royaume de Dieu'" *Revue Biblique*, 99: 98–131.

Stuckenbruck, L. (2001), "Daniel and Early Enoch Traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in J. Collins and P. Flint (eds), *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, 2 vols (Leiden: Brill), 2:368–86.

Tov, E. (ed.) (2002), *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series* (*DJD* 39; Oxford: Clarendon).

SESSION 3

5

The Paradox of *Midrash* and the Apocalyptic Author: From Mesopotamian Divination to Rabbinic Midrash, through Qumran and Apocalypse

Paul Mandel

Introduction

In this paper I compare an aspect appearing in two phenomena in Jewish thought and narrative of roughly the same period: Jewish apocalyptic narratives from the third century BCE until the second century CE, and the rabbinic and pre-rabbinic Jewish literature involving a *doresh*/*darshan*, including texts of the Qumran sect, early rabbinic genres, and related Jewish sources of the period. The aspect in question is the tension between the divinity of a message and the humanity of the messenger—in particular, the extent to which the expounder of a divine message expresses an ability to fathom divine will while at the same time admitting, or at least not hiding, his completely human nature.

1. The rabbinic activity of midrash

Rabbinic midrash between scriptural explication and instruction

In an oft-cited tale found in the Babylonian Talmud describing an encounter during a banquet between two sages of the late third century CE, the Babylonian Rav Naḥman and the Palestinian Rabbi Isaac (*BT Ta'anit* 5b), the latter is requested to "say something," meaning, to offer some statement of importance, a "word of *Torah*." To the puzzlement of Rav Naḥman, Rabbi Isaac cites a statement of his teacher, Rabbi Yoḥanan, that "Jacob our father did not die." In response to Rav Naḥman's objection that the biblical account specifically describes Jacob's burial, Rabbi Isaac says:

> He said: [It is] a Scriptural verse that I expound [*mikra ani doresh*], as it is said: "Therefore fear thou not, O Jacob, my servant, says the Lord; neither be dismayed, O Israel. For I will save you from afar and your seed from the land of their captivity" (Jer. 30:10). [The verse] likens him [= Jacob] to his progeny [= Israel]: as his progeny is alive, so he too is alive.

When Rabbi Isaac uses the verb *doresh* in connection with a verse from Scripture to justify what is patently contradicted by the biblical narrative account, he appeals to a rabbinic mode of interpretation commonly used to extract legal rulings from a biblical text, where the juxtaposition of two adjacent parts of a sentence allows the expounder to draw analogies between them: Jacob is compared by Scripture here to his progeny, and is therefore, like them, "alive," despite textual and logical evidence to the contrary. We may assume that Rabbi Isaac never intended to deny the historical fact of Jacob's death, but rather intended to be understood figuratively, referring to a symbolic or metaphoric existence of Jacob: the spirit of Jacob is alive as long as his children continue to exist. Yet on another level this *midrash* answers an interesting anomaly of the biblical narrative, since, as opposed to the biblical description of the demise of his forefathers Abraham (Gen. 25:8) and Isaac (ibid. 35:29), the verb "die" is missing from the description of Jacob's death (ibid. 49:33). The *midrash* is thus a combination of figurative message and textual explication; it is not clear which of these is to be taken more seriously.

Although textual analysis and a close reading of Scripture may have been the motivation of the teaching of Rabbi Yoḥanan as cited by Rabbi Isaac, it is difficult to discount the central role of Rabbi Isaac himself in utilizing this enigmatic statement of his teacher for wider purposes—indeed, for an agenda that may have been particular to Rabbi Isaac and historically apt: during Rabbi Isaac's lifetime the Jewish community in the Land of Israel suffered from a combination of Roman persecutions and economic instability, and many of Rabbi Isaac's dicta describe with pathos these unfortunate circumstances and attempt to comfort the people by entertaining hope for the future.[1]

Darash *as public instruction*

While later texts, especially those from the amoraic period, often use the verb *darash* and the associated noun, *midrash*, in explicit contexts of textual analysis, earlier uses of these words are not only—and, indeed, not particularly—found in contexts of textual interpretation and explication;[2] rather, the word *darash*

1. Cf *Pekikta de-Rav Kahana*, *piska* 12 (*Baḥodesh hashelishi*), par. 2 (ed. Mandelbaum, 205): "Rabbi Isaac said: Formerly, when money was plentiful, a man would yearn for a passage of *mishnah* and a passage of *talmud* (legal corpora); but now, when money is scarce, and moreover, when we ill-suffer from the (governing) kingdoms, a man yearns for a passage of Scripture and a passage of *aggadah* (Scriptural lore)."

2. See Mandel, "'*Darash Rabbi Peloni*': A New Study," *Dappim: Research in Literature*, 16–17 (2009), 27–55 [Hebrew]. Examples include Sifré Deut. *piska* 203 (ed. Finkelstein,

signifies primarily a stance of public instruction in *halakhah* (law) or *haggadah* (lore), whether accompanied by an analysis of Scripture or not. The special use of the verb *darash* in the context of scriptural explication may be seen as a subset of general instruction which gained prominence especially during the latter half of the second century CE, when traditional legal norms were formulated and codified in orally transmitted collections (*mishnayot*). These norms, often transmitted originally without basis in Scripture, were then accompanied by a legal analysis of Scripture that provided a basis for traditional legal dicta.[3] It is not, as is usually assumed, that *darash* implies textual investigation,[4] but rather, that the implications of the textual analysis of a scriptural verse, as a result of logically applied canons of interpretation, were publicly expounded (= taught) for the edification of the hearers.

The petiḥah *form: Identification of hidden meanings in Scripture*

The *petiḥah* form appears at the beginning of midrashic sections in classical works such as Genesis Rabbah; in it, verses chosen mostly from the Hagiographa are expounded in connection with the first significant verse of the Scriptural passage upon which the *petiḥah* is based. Whatever the origin of the genre,[5] the essence of the *petiḥah* provides identification of the verse from a Scriptural verse from Prophets or the Hagiographa with an earlier biblical event or person, with the purpose of uncovering the hidden meaning inherent in the cited verse by demonstrating a reference to this event.[6] I have suggested that the term *pataḥ* (= "opened") should be understood in this context, as in other figurative occurrences of this verb in early rabbinic literature, in the sense of "uncover" or "reveal": the object of the activity is the *petiḥah* verse itself, the meaning of which is uncovered ("opened") by the expounder's identification of this verse with earlier

239) and Mekhilta Deut. (ed. Kahana, 356) (cf. M. Kahana, "Pages of the Deuteronomy *Mekhilta* on *Ha'azinu* and *Wezot Ha-berakha*" [Hebrew], *Tarbiẓ* 57 [1987–8], 165–201 [170 and n. 26]).

3. Cf. Mishnah *Yoma* 8, 9, where the norm, that the Day of Atonement does not atone for sins between a man and his fellow, is derived from a particular parsing of the verse in Lev. 16:30; the lesson is introduced by the verb *darash*.

4. See I. Heinmann, "On the Development of Technical Terms for Biblical Interpretation: *darash*," *Leshonenu*, 14 (1946): 182–189 [Hebrew].

5. See: J. Heinemann, "The Proem in the Aggadic Midrashim: A Form-critical Study," *Scripta Hierosolymitana*, 22 (1971), 100–22; J. Fraenkel, *Darkei Haagadah vehamidrash* (Ramat Gan, 1991), 445–8; P. Mandel, "On *Pataḥ* and on the *Petiḥah* – A New Study" (Hebrew), in Y. Elbaum, G. Hasan-Rokem and J. Levinson (eds), *Higayon L'Yona: New Aspects in the Study of Midrash, Aggadah and Piyut, in Honor of Professor Yona Fraenkel* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 2007), 49–82.

6. For an example of the early form of the *petihah*, see Genesis Rabbah 38, 5 (ed. Theodor-Albeck, 353; cf. the text in MS Vat. 30).

biblical historical events.[7] Thus, the *petiḥah* form provides a revelatory moment surrounding a verse of Scripture.[8]

Darash *and* Midrash *as human revelation of divine will: The paradox*

A common characteristic of the above phenomena is the role of the *darshan* as instructor and transmitter of knowledge considered to be of divine origin (legal dicta, scriptural passages), the discovery of which is the result of human endeavor.[9] Whether the law is derived from an analysis of juristic principles, an application of legal precedent, or an interpretation of a biblical passage, the Sages were well aware of their own responsibility and individual authority in determining the law. This is exemplified in the following passage, where *midrash* is likened to bread, a manufactured item (signifying the deduction of law from scriptural sources), while the *halakhot* and *haggadot*—the divinely ordained, traditional and transmitted laws and lore—originate directly from God's mouth:

> "One does not live by bread alone" (Deut. 8:3)—this is *midrash*; "but by every word that comes from the mouth of the Lord" (ibid.)—these are *halakhot* and *haggadot*.[10]

Midrash is thus understood paradoxically to be a human activity revealing a divine message. In passages from the early centuries of the rabbinic period it is not the Scriptural text that occupies center stage as the object of rabbinic activity; rather, the *ḥakham* in his role as *darshan* serves as an instructor, acting mostly in public arenas. His instruction is both a relaying of the legacy of ancient law and lore which he had imbibed[11] and an expounding of his understanding and mediation of that legacy. This takes place not only through the declaration of independent dicta, but also through the discovery of previously unknown messages.

7. Mandel, "On *Pataḥ* and on the *Petiḥah* – A New Study"; idem, "Midrashic Exegesis and its Precedents in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 8 (2001): 149–68 (159–61).

8. Compare the use of the verb *dianoigō* as used in the account in Luke 24:32, possibly reflecting a calque of the Hebrew/Aramaic verb *pataḥ* in the same sense of *uncovering* the hidden meaning of Scriptures through its identification with the current historical occurrence (cf. Luke 24:44).

9. See the term *midrash* in Sifra *Beḥuqotai*, *parashah* 2, 1, referring to the instruction of the Sages.

10. Sifré Deut., par. 48 (ed. Finkelstein, 113).

11. A disciple of the sages (*talmid ḥakhamim*) underwent a training period of some length where he "served" a sage (*shimush ḥakhamim*). During his training he was expected to apply discrimination in learning the proper instructional and juridical methods from his master; cf. Mishna *Avot* 5:15, where the ideal disciple is likened to a sieve, sifting what he hears, as opposed to a sponge which absorbs everything.

2. Instructional and revelatory activity in the Second Temple period

Precedents to rabbinic intellectual activity during the Second Temple period

The investigation of the precedents and sources of rabbinic activity, and especially the activity of *midrash*, has led scholars to compare the rabbinic corpus and its methods with Jewish sources of the Second Temple period. No doubt the narratives of Scripture served as the basis for renewed interpretations in works of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha (the so-called "Re-written Bible"), and, as is increasingly realized in recent years, legal discussions and controversies also occupy a large segment of Second Temple literature. In particular, the *pesher* form, in which hidden historical references to current events are discovered in ancient prophecies, presents a parallel to the rabbinic method of the *petiḥah*, although with a significant difference: in the early rabbinic method biblical verses are "revealed" as signifying *earlier* biblical events, while in the *pesher* literature later or current historical events and persons (often of eschatological significance) are the referents of the Scriptural text.[12]

The *pesher* form is ascribed by the authors of the Qumran texts to the activity of the sect's leader, the *moreh haẓedek*, "to whom God has announced all the secrets of the words of His servants the prophets" (*Pesher Ḥabakkuk* 7, 3–5). Another name for this person is *doresh haTorah*, the "teacher of the law."[13] As above, the term *doresh* in this title, as well as in the term *midrash Torah* appearing in the Qumran texts, implies an activity of instruction, usually in matters of law, and not interpretation.[14] The phrase is equivalent to that used by Josephus in relation to the Pharisees and other individuals, who are called *exegetai* of the ancestral laws (*patrioi nomoi*). The Greek term, which should not be confused with the modern sense of "exegesis," is used in the sense of a guide and interpreter, as a mediator

12. See Mandel, "The Origins of *Midrash* in the Second Temple Period," in Carol Bakhos (ed.), *Current Trends in the Study of Midrash* (Supplements to the *Journal for the Study of Judaism*, vol. 106; Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2006), 9–34; idem, "*Darash Rabbi Ploni,*" 41–4.

13. The word *Torah* as appearing in Qumran texts almost always designates the complete set of instructions commanded by God through Moses, and is used as a general term for the Mosaic law-code; cf. *Damascus Document* 15, 9; 15, 12; *Community Rule* (1QS) 5, 8; 8, 22.

14. The term *doresh haTorah* has been understood by scholars as "one who studies the law" or as an "interpreter of Scripture"; see S. D. Fraade, "Interpretive Authority in the Studying Community at Qumran," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 44 (1993): 46–69. However, in no passage of the Dead Sea scrolls is textual activity imputed to the *doresh*, whose special character lay in the knowledge of the laws bequeathed to him, whether through direct divine revelation or through instruction from superiors and its transmission to others; cf. Damascus Document (CD), col. 6, 2–11; Rule of the Community (1QS), col. 8, 10–12. See J. Maier, "Early Jewish Biblical Interpretation in the Qumran Literature," *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament*, I/I (1996): 108–20; Mandel, "*INCLUSIO*: On the Final Section of the Damascus Document and its Literary Significance," *Meghilot*, 2 (2004): 141–58 [Hebrew].

and translator of messages previously hidden from the recipient; in classical sources it appears primarily in the context of guidance in matters of unwritten regulations. The Pharisees are thus understood to be experts in the expounding of the unwritten and traditional laws to the people who are in need of instruction in these laws.[15]

The activities of instruction, and in particular the deciphering of hidden messages, explain the use of the term *sofer* ("scribe") and the Aramaic cognate *safar* in Jewish texts from the Second Temple period, during which the term underwent a process of linguistic specification.[16] In the bilingual administrative society in Mesopotamia of the Neo-Assyrian period, the term *safar*, originating as a term for the Aramaic translator-scribe,[17] became a name for a translator/interpreter (or "decoder") of signs, and thus was used as a term for a diviner as well as an interpreter of law and mediator of divine messages. Its use as a formal title, as applied to figures such as Ezra, Enoch, and Aḥiqar, relates to revelations and advisory functions that these individuals performed for others.[18] The term served as the basis for the Greek *grammateus* in the New Testament and II Maccabees as a term for a group of individuals primarily interested in law (named in parallel sources as *nomikos* = law instructor),[19] and was also used by the Aramaic biblical translator to designate diviners and law-deciders (*meḥoqeq*).[20] In rabbinic texts the term *soferim* refers to a group of law deciders from the past who acted as

15. See Mandel, "Scriptural Exegesis and the Pharisees in Josephus," *Journal of Jewish Studies*, 58 (2007): 19–32.

16. See Mandel, "The Origins of *Midrash*," 14–23.

17. See J. Lewy, "The Problems Inherent in Section 70 of the Bisutun Inscription," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, 25 (1954), 169–208 (188–200), and notes there (nn. 105, 108); H. Tadmor, "On the Role of Aramaic in the Assyrian Empire," in M. Mori et al. (eds), *Near Eastern Studies Dedicated to H.I.H. Prince Takahito Mikasa on the Occasion of his Seventy-fifth Birthday* (Wiesbaden, 1991), 419–35 [Hebrew].

18. See Ezra 7:10; 1 Enoch 12, 3; 15, 1; and the narrative of Aḥiqar, lines 1, 12, 19 and 27 (*The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 2, ed. J. H. Charles [Garden City, 1985], 494–7).

19. The *nomikos* is the proper idiomatic translation of the Aramaic *safar* (see Mark 12:28 and Matthew 22:35; II Macc 6, 18 and IV Macc 5:4), whereas *grammateus* was the literal translation of the Aramaic *safar* (Hebrew *sofer*) based on the usual Septuagint translation of this word.

20. Cf. the Aramaic Targum Jonathan ben Uziel to I Sam. 10:5-13, 19:20-24, and 28:6, where *safar* translates biblical *navi* (prophet) in his function as responder to queries concerning God's law, as well in the contexts of a diviner, and is also used to translate the Scriptural *meḥoqeq* as "law-giver" (see Targum Onkelos and Neofiti to Gen. 49:10, Num. 21:18, and Deut. 33:21, and Targum Jonathan ben Uziel to Jud. 5:9). Cf. A. J. Saldarini, "'Is Saul Also Among the Scribes?': Scribes and Prophets in Targum Jonathan," in H. J. Blumberg et al. (eds), *"Open Thou Mine Eyes …": Essays on Aggadah and Judaica Presented to Rabbi William G. Braude on His Eightieth Birthday and Dedicated to His Memory* (Hoboken, NJ: Ktav, 1992), 239–53; C. T. R. Hayward, "Some Notes on Scribes and Priests in the Targum of the Prophets," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 36 (1985): 210–21.

enactors and interpreters of the oral law.[21] Whereas the ancient Mesopotamian translator/decoder acted as advisor to the king and other high officials, decoding and translating divine messages "written" in the guise of celestial events,[22] the law-interpreter of a later age was accorded the same title, as one who "translated" the divine will as embodied in laws.[23]

The significance of mediation in the development of intellectual leadership during the Second Temple period

Returning to the *pesher* form of the Dead Sea Scrolls, we may identify the equivalent activity as reflected in Mesopotamian culture, the Akkadian *pišru*, the "solution," offered by the astrologer/diviner in his interpretation of the celestial event. It is significant that the ability of the Mesopotamian decoder-diviner to correctly identify the divine message in the celestial phenomenon and interpret it as a harbinger of an historical occurrence arose not from a mantic capacity on his part, but rather from his acquired knowledge of oral and written sources (the omen literature) used as guides and keys to the decoding procedure. The *pišru* was not an interpretation of a text, but rather the decoding of the divine message itself which had been embedded in the "heavenly writing" through the correct application of the omen; it was understood as the uncovering ("solution") of celestial knowledge, providing the key and guide to the projected historical occurrence. Similarly, the Qumranic *pesher* was not the result of interpretive acumen of the *doresh*/*moreh*, but of his knowledge of the correct key and guide in decoding the divine message, embodied and hidden in the prophetic text but not equivalent to the text itself. The *posher*, like his Mesopotamian predecessors, thus fulfilled an important societal role in mediating and interpreting hidden celestial

21. See Tosefta *Miqwaot* 5:4; Mishnah *Orlah* 3, 9; *Yebamot* 2, 4; *Kelim* 13, 7. Many enactments of the *soferim* are in the realm of purities, a classic aspect of ritual law. The titles *sofer*/*safar* figure prominently in epigraphs on ossuaries of the Second Temple period, second only to *kohen* ("priest") as an honorary title; the title refers to a revered figure, one who may be assumed to have performed the role of law-interpreter and guide for the people. See: R. Hachlili, *Jewish Funerary Customs, Practices and Rites in the Second Temple Period* (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2005), 215–16.

22. The Akkadian term *ṭupšarru*, "inscriber on tablets," went through the same process of linguistic specification, and became synonymous with a diviner, especially of celestial phenomena; see F. Rochberg, *The Heavenly Writing: Divination, Horoscopy, and Astronomy in Mesopotamian Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2004); J. Bottéro, *Ancestor of the West: Writing, Reasoning, and Religion in Mesopotamia, Elam, and Greece*, trans. T. L. Fagan (Chicago, London: Chicago University Press, 2000 [French edition: 1996]), 44; *Religion in Ancient Mesopotamia* (Chicago, London: Chicago University Press, 2001 [French edition: 1998]), 92, 178–9.

23. See Ezra 7:10, where Ezra is said to have prepared himself "*lidrosh et torat adonai*," which, as the parallel of the following phrase demonstrates, should be translated "to teach God's Law" (cf. 7:12, 21).

knowledge.[24] The importance of human mediation of divine messages is thus a common element in Mesopotamian divination and in the cultural milieu of the Second Temple period Jewish literature.

3. The paradox of apocalyptic writing in cultural context

The Mesopotamian background of apocalypticism and the apocalyptic author

Scholars have repeatedly pointed to the Mesopotamian background to the Jewish apocalyptic tradition.[25] Despite certain reservations,[26] there is no doubt that strong affinities exist between ancient Mesopotamian traditions and different aspects of the apocalyptic writings (notably, Enoch and Daniel). Especially intriguing is the supposition that mantic wisdom provided a basis for the emphasis in apocalyptic literature on revelation through cryptic signs, mostly celestial in origin.[27] However, the assumption of the influence of Mesopotamian traditions leaves open the question of "why this kind of literature was created"—in other words, "the sociological factors underlying the emergence of apocalyptic."[28]

Here I wish to bring attention to the same type of paradox inherent in apocalyptic writings as in the midrashic/rabbinic stance of interpretation discussed above. In the apocalyptic narrative the hero, a mortal, is initiated into divine secrets and partakes of divine knowledge heretofore kept secret from men, and is granted a revelation through a heavenly medium which he sometimes reveals to other men, or, at times, is encouraged to keep secret. These secret revelations are mostly encoded and require interpretation. They provide not only a glimpse into the transcendental "otherness," the numinous quality, of the divine word and world, but also contain a message for mortals or other beings. The message is often concerned with divine justice, salvation, and a historically related resolution to a

24. See U. Gabbay, "Akkadian Commentaries from Ancient Mesopotamia and their Relation to Early Hebrew Exegesis," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 19 (2012): 267–312 (298–305).

25. See H. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988); J. J. Collins, "The Place of Apocalypicism in the Religion of Israel," in P. D. Miller, Jr., P. D. Hanson and S. D. McBride (eds), *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 539–58; Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 23–9; J. C. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (CBQMS 16; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984), 61–70.

26. Cf. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 26–29; Collins, "The Place of Apocalypticism," 542–4, 551.

27. See H.-P. Müller, "Mantische Weisheiten Apokalyptik," *Congress Volume: Uppsala 1971* (1972), 268–93; J. J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press: 1977), 67–88; VanderKam, *Enoch*, Ch. 3.

28. Kvanvig, Roots of Apocalyptic, 611.

sociopolitical problem. It is the function of the apocalyptic *author* to provide at least a partial interpretation and decoding of these messages for the edification of the reader/hearer. Undoubtedly, the apocalyptic author felt himself completely human; at the same time, he took the role of interpreter seriously, and, it may be assumed, believed in the significance of his message.[29]

The human ability to divine: A common paradox?

I suggest that this situation involves, to a certain extent, a mirror of the paradox of the *doresh* discussed above. If we ask what the motivation of the apocalyptic author might have been in presenting the revelation of celestial secrets through a human mediator, we necessarily must ponder the extent of identification of the author with aspects of the content of his work.[30] For many of these authors, oral transmission of ancient myths and narratives cannot be ruled out, and their role in the transmission of these myths may have taken on, in their own view, a spiritual aspect.

Thus the paradox of the apocalyptic author may present a parallel model to the paradox of the *sofer*/*safar*, the Qumranic *doresh haTorah* and *posher,* and the early rabbinic *darshan*, as outlined in the first parts of this paper. In each case, the individual occupies a role of leadership and instruction for his audience. The content of his instruction is understood to be of divine origin, and is often considered to have been hidden from the populace. The revelation of the divine message carries supreme importance for a crucial moment in history and frequently deals with questions of history, past and present. Above all, the one responsible for the revelation of the divine/celestial message does not relinquish his humanity; indeed, the retention of that humanity is imperative for the accurate conveyance of the divine message: it is precisely because of this humanity that it is possible for the author, as well as for the hero of the apocalyptic narrative, to retain a sufficient amount of empathy and identification with his audience for purposes of edification and consolation.

29. See M. Stone ("Visions and Pseudepigraphy," in his *Ancient Judaism: New Visions and Views* [Grand Rapids and Cambridge, UK, 2011], 90–121), who argues for a serious consideration of the validity and personal integrity of the apocryphal and pseudepigraphic authors who may have experienced what they felt to be authentic religious visions and experiences, which they then translated into their narratives. Of the apocryphal and pseudepigraphic works Stone writes: "They are religious works, by religious people, and we must consider religious experience when we interpret them" (105). It is precisely because of the assumed integrity of these authors in their belief that they are relating actual religious experience and knowledge that deepens the paradox discussed here, that the authors were undoubtedly aware of their own human contribution to the form and content of their narratives.

30. See Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 40: "[T]he apocalyptists may have felt an intense and emotional kinship with their pseudonymous counterparts, while still being aware of the fiction involved." Cf. Stone, op. cit.

It is possible that the complex of characteristics common to these separate intellectual endeavors arose during the meeting of cultures that resulted when Judaic society was exiled to Babylonia, when the elite and mostly priestly circle of leaders and intellectuals found themselves bereft of the prophetic activity that guided both leaders and laymen in the previous era. At this time these leaders came into contact with a most interesting activity: that of the "deductive divination" of the Mesopotamian diviners, who, without pretending to any divine status or even inspiration, believed themselves able to correctly "read" and fathom the divine will as this was "written" in the celestial events.[31] The revelation of this will, bound up with current historical reality, was transmitted by the diviner to his audience. The Mesopotamian activity was transplanted onto post-exilic Judaic society, providing the Jewish leader of men the belief that he too could attain knowledge of the divine messages and fathom the divine will through proper modes of interpretation and decoding. In the realm of religious history this public function was taken over by the apocalyptic author, who felt authorized to transmit his message through an interpretive translation and revelation of divine, celestial truths. In rabbinic and proto-rabbinic circles, it bolstered the parallel activity of the law-decider, who could transmit legal norms of divine origin to the people.

The societal roles of midrash and apocalypse and their historical importance

The emphasis of this paper has been on the societal function of the individuals apparent in the various Jewish literatures of the Second Temple period within the community of individuals who searched out and listened to their instruction. The significance of the emphasis on an instructional model can be appreciated, I believe, by a comparison with the alternate, "textual-interpretive," model of *midrashic*, Qumranic, and apocalyptic behaviors, where the arena of activity of the interpreter takes place primarily between the interpreter and the text itself.[32] While the latter, as an individual scholarly activity, can take place anywhere—in one's innermost reading room as well as in the public arena—and need not have an audience, I propose that the instructional model suggested here correctly accounts for the central place given to the interpreter within his society. This was particularly significant for Jewish culture of the Hasmonean period and beyond,

31. See J. J. Collins, "Jewish Apocalyptic Against its Hellenistic Near-Eastern Environment," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, 220 (1975): 27–36 (31); F. Rochberg, *The Heavenly Writing*; J. Bottéro, *Ancestor of the West*, loc. cit.; idem, *Religion in Ancient Mesopotamia*, loc. cit.

32. See M. Fishbane, "The Role of Scribes in the Transmission of Biblical Literature," *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1985), 24—37; J. Kugel, *In Potiphar's House: The Interpretive Life of Biblical Texts* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994), 247–68; J. Kugel, "Ancient Biblical Interpretation and the Biblical Sage," in J. Kugel (ed.), *Studies in Ancient Midrash*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001), 3–7.

when importance was placed on the correct interpretation and divination of God's will in the context of the often tumultuous events of the period.[33]

In sum, the central place accorded to man in the uncovering of additional meanings and lessons that were understood to have a divine origin, in *midrash* as well as in the apocalyptic literature, presents a paradox: while it is definitely man's initiative and intellectual endeavor that creates both the midrashic lesson and the apocalyptic narrative, the resulting lesson is seen as one of divine instruction. This paradox underlies the fundamental activity of Jewish leaders during the Second Temple period, who were confident in their understanding of the divine message and who saw as their major function the translation of this message to the people. I point to a common element of decoding divine messages current in the Mesopotamian East as a basis for understanding the inherently human element of this activity, as the revealer-instructor performed his role as mediator of divine messages for the religious, social, and political edification of his community.

33. See also J. J. Collins, 'Jewish Apocalyptic,' where a similar analysis of the Qumran and Apocalyptic literature is presented against the background of the pervasive Hellenistic Near-Eastern environment.

Response to Mandel

Kenneth Atkinson

Paul Mandel has written an intriguing paper that compares a wide range of literature from the Babylonian era to the rabbinic periods. He focuses on the tension between the divinity of a message and the humanity of the messenger. Mandel includes many parallels from a variety of periods to help us understand these topics. He engages several Jewish apocalyptic narratives, which are of use to the investigation of the social and historical backgrounds of apocalyptic literature of the Seleucid and Hasmonean periods. In this response I will focus on one aspect of Mandel's work that I believe is particularly appropriate to the theme of this first Nangeroni Meeting, namely his discussion of *doresh*/*darshan*.

Mandel notes that the verb *doresh* suggests a particular way of reading a scriptural verse that is similar to *midrash halakha.* It allows an expounder (*darshan*) to draw analogies between two adjacent parts of a sentence. Although much of the rabbinic corpus appears to deny the historical facts as described in the biblical narrative, Mandel notes that there are rules of conduct for this method of exegesis. In his discussion of *midrash*, Mandel comments that interpreters sought to answer interesting cruxes or anomalies of the biblical perspective. He notes that many texts, especially those from the Amoraic period, often use the verb *d-r-sh* and the associated noun, *midrash*, in explicit contexts of textual analysis. He suggests that the word *darash* signifies primarily a stance of public instruction in *halakhah* (law) or *haggadah* (lore), whether accompanied by an analysis of Scripture or not. Mandel's numerous examples and discussions of these concepts raise several interesting questions regarding the Qumran literature, particularly the continuous *Pesharim* that recount history and the possible oral nature of some of this literature. His work also raises many questions concerning the increased output of apocalyptic writings during the Seleucid and Hasmonean periods.

Mandel discusses a form of Amoraic *midrash* known as the *petihah* in which a verse is chosen, usually from one of the later books of the writings (especially from Psalms, Proverbs, Job or Ecclesiastes), and expounded upon in connection with the first significant verse of the pericope. He suggests that the term *patah* (="opened") should be understood, as in other figurative occurrences of this verb in early rabbinic literature, in the sense of "uncover"/"reveal": the object of the activity is the "petihah" verse, the meaning of which is "uncovered" by the expounder's identification of this verse with earlier biblical historical events. What is perhaps most important in his discussion of this type of literature is his suggestion that tannaitic precedents to the *petihah* form are found in passages in tannaitic literature in which an early biblical event or character is found "referenced" in verses from the Prophets or the Hagiographa. Mandel suggests this reflects a reaction to earlier attempts at identifying similar passages with contemporary historical events, such as those propounded by the Essene authors of the Qumran texts as well as by the authors of the New Testament literature. If correct, then this rabbinic literature may contain accurate information about

exegetical traditions from the Second Temple period, including possible apocalyptic reactions to historical events. Some may object to studies such as Mandel's that make significant use of rabbinic evidence to understand the Hasmonean period and Qumran literature. This is because it is widely accepted that much of the rabbinic corpus is not historical, but often reflects the idealized world of the rabbis and therefore is of limited value for historical reconstruction.[1] However, historians should not be so quick to reject this extremely valuable, and extensive, corpus of literature. If it can be demonstrated that the rabbis of later generations preserve traditions reflected in Qumran writings and other related Second Temple period apocalyptic texts, then it is likely that there is some relationship between the two groups of writings and that the rabbinic literature preserves accurate historical and theological materials from earlier periods. But it is also possible that the differences between the rabbinic materials and Second Temple writings reflect later reactions to earlier methods of interpretation. If so, the rabbinic corpus may help us to understand earlier methods of exegesis that may have been rejected by later generations. Mandel's study includes several examples of both possibilities, and therefore has the potential to shed some valuable light on the historical development of the apocalyptic worldview of the Seleucid and Hasmonean periods.

Mandel's comments regarding the instructor's role as a transmitter of knowledge of divine origin invites comparisons with the elusive figure known as the Teacher of Righteousness, whose study brought to light esoteric meanings of Scripture that guided his community. The Qumran *pesharim* are particularly instructive for comparison with Mandel's examples, since the Teacher of Righteousness apparently taught a specific method of reading biblical texts to his community.[2] In his exegesis of the famous passage in CD 7.18 regarding the messianic text of Numbers 24:17, Mandel notes that the Teacher of Righteousness not only expounded the law, but that he revealed a new set of laws for the present life of his community. He is portrayed as a law-interpreter and a teacher of the law to the public, who also reveals the hidden meaning of prophecies recorded in the *pesharim*. Mandel notes this is what Josephus claims was the method of the Pharisees: they were also guides and interpreter of the law.[3] Here, the Qumran literature may suggest that a conflict existed between the Pharisees and the Qumran community regarding oral interpretation. In the *Pesher Nahum* 3:1-12, for example, the author denounces those of Ephraim who by their "false teaching" (בתלמוד) lead others astray (4Q168

1. For this issue, see further the classic study of Jacob Neusner, *The Rabbinic Traditions About the Pharisees Before 70* (Leiden: Brill, 1971).

2. See further Hanan Eshel, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hasmonean State* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 29–61. For a relevant discussion of the authority of texts and interpreters based on the Qumran writings, see George J. Brooke, "Authority and the Authoritativeness of Scripture: Some Clues from the Dead Sea Scrolls," *RevQ* 100 (2012): 507–23.

3. For this possibility, see further John J. Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 113–18.

Frags. 3–4, col. II, 8). The term *talmûd* presumably carries its rabbinic meaning here and elsewhere in this *pesher* and refers to oral interpretation.[4]

Mandel comments that legal discussions and controversies, so prevalent in the rabbinic corpus, also occupied the attention of the authors of a large portion of Second Temple literature. Several parallels, he suggests, show similarities between rabbinic *midrash* and Jewish sources of the Second Temple period. His argument is well supported by the evidence, but he also highlights significant differences between these two bodies of works. Mandel notes that in the Qumran *pesharim* hidden historical references to current events are discovered in biblical prophecies.[5] The focus appears to be historical, and current and/or future events are seen to be presaged in the biblical account.[6] This emphasis is missing in tannaitic rabbinic exegesis, which rarely connects current and/or future events with the biblical text. This raises the intriguing question as to whether the differences between the rabbinic midrash and the Qumran sect's use of prophetic passages bears witness to a later rabbinic rejection of this earlier method of interpretation.[7]

Moshe Bernstein, in his study of citation formula in the Qumran texts, notes that in documents such as CD biblical citations are merely used to buttress the author's argument. The frame of reference is not the scriptural text, but the author's argument.[8] This is similar to Mandel's comments on the function of the *hakham* himself, whose role as *darshan* is primarily as an instructor who expounds his understanding of ancient law and lore. Bernstein, moreover, notes that in the thematic *pesharim* the author's stance is completely within the biblical document, and the commentary moves from verse to verse.[9] In the *pesharim*, moreover, history dominates: the authors of these texts seek both to recount and explain events of their time as well as predict the future through their uncovering of the biblical text's esoteric, hidden meaning.[10] These texts, as well as much

4. Maurya Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books* (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1979), 184.

5. See further Daniel A. Machiela, "The Qumran Pesharim as Biblical Commentaries Historical Context and Lines of Development," *DSD* 19 (2013): 313–62.

6. For the use of history in the Qumran texts, see further Edward Dąbrowa, "The Hasmoneans in the Light of the Qumran Scrolls," in Armin Lange, Emanuel Tov, and Matthias Weigold (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Context: Integrating the Dead Sea Scrolls in the Study of Ancient Texts, Languages, and Cultures* (VTSup 140/II; Leiden: Brill, 2011), 501–10.

7. For his more extensive comments on these issues, see Paul Mandel, "Exegesis and its Precedents in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *DSD* 8 (2001): 149–68.

8. Moshe J. Bernstein, "Introductory Formulas for Citation and Re-Citation of Biblical Verses in the Qumran Pesharim: Observations on a Pesher Technique," *DSD* 1 (1994): 69.

9. Bernstein, "Introductory Formulas," 70.

10. For this issue, see further the extensive discussions in James H. Charlesworth, *The Pesharim and Qumran History: Chaos or Consensus?*, with appendixes by Lidija Novakovic (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), esp. 80–118.

Jewish apocalyptic literature, appear in large numbers during the Hellenistic and early Roman periods. In these works the present is valued as less than the past, and the authors seek to uncover divine knowledge embedded within the biblical text to help contemporary readers survive.[11] The large quantity of such literature produced during the Hellenistic period, and its absence in the rabbinic corpus examined by Mandel, suggests that something has changed in the intervening period. The Qumran texts may offer a possible solution to help us bridge this gap between the world of the rabbis and the Qumran sectarians.

For reasons unknown, the Qumran sectarians ceased their production of apocalyptic writings and literature that used Scripture to explain the tumultuous historical events of their time shortly after the Roman conquest.[12] It was likely their failed predictions regarding the Seleucids and the Romans that led the Qumran community to cease their production of written texts and to restrict their activities to oral interpretations. It was the oral method, adopted by the Pharisees and the precursors of the rabbis, which eventually became normative for Judaism. Mandel's paper helps to bridge this gap between written and oral interpretation as represented in the Dead Sea Scrolls, and raises the question as to whether historical events of the Seleucid period not only stimulated the development of Jewish apocalyptic literature, but whether the failure of this literature to adequately interpret Scripture led to its demise, and prepared the way for the transformation of Judaism to a culture based on oral interpretations largely devoid of historical interpretation, many of which were eventually written down in the rabbinic corpus.

Bibliography

Bernstein, Moshe J., "Introductory Formulas for Citation and Re-Citation of Biblical Verses in the Qumran Pesharim: Observations on a Pesher Technique," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 1 (1994): 30–70.

Brooke, George J., "Authority and the Authoritativeness of Scripture: Some Clues from the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Revue de Qumran* 100 (2012): 507–23.

Charlesworth, James H., *The Pesharim and Qumran History: Chaos or Consensus?*, with appendixes by Lidija Novakovic (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002).

Collins, John J., *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010).

Collins, John J., "Jewish Apocalyptic Against Its Hellenistic near-Eastern Environment," *Bulletin of the American School of Oriental Research* 220 (1975): 27–36.

Dąbrowa, Edward, "The Hasmoneans in the Light of the Qumran Scrolls," in Armin

11. See further John J. Collins, "Jewish Apocalyptic Against Its Hellenistic near-Eastern Environment," *Bulletin of the American School of Oriental Research* 220 (1975): 27–36.

12. For the paleographical dates of the Dead Sea Scrolls, see Brian Webster, "Chronological Index of the Texts from the Judaean Desert," in Emanuel Tov (ed.), *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indicies and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series* (DJD 39; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002), 351–446.

Lange, Emanuel Tov, and Matthias Weigold (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Context: Integrating the Dead Sea Scrolls in the Study of Ancient Texts, Languages, and Cultures* (VTSup 140/II; Leiden: Brill, 2011), 501–10.

Eshel, Hanan, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hasmonean State* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008).

Horgan, Maurya, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books* (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1979).

Mandel, Paul, "Exegesis and its Precedents in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 8 (2001): 149–68.

Neusner, Jacob, *The Rabbinic Traditions About the Pharisees Before 70* (Leiden: Brill, 1971).

Machiela, Daniel A., "The Qumran Pesharim as Biblical Commentaries Historical Context and Lines of Development," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 19 (2013): 313–62.

Webster, Brian, "Chronological Index of the Texts from the Judaean Desert," in Emanuel Tov (ed.), *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indicies and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series* (DJD 39; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002), 351–446.

6

Apocalyptic Elements in Hasmonean Propaganda: Civic Ideology and the Struggle for Political Legitimation

Yonder Moynihan Gillihan

1. Introduction

Criticism of the Hasmonean dynasty from an apocalyptic perspective is a familiar topic, but the role that apocalypticism played in Hasmonean civic ideology—whether as an external influence or as an integral component—has received much less attention. This short paper approaches the topic by analyzing some "apocalyptic elements" that appear in the Hasmonean propaganda that survives in literary form, i.e. in 1 Maccabees and a few statements in Josephus. Its brief and partial sketch of evidence, problems, method, and provisional results anticipates a fuller account of civic ideology in Judea, c. 200 BCE–200 CE that my ongoing research will produce.[1] This conference paper provides a welcome opportunity to test a hypothesis that I presented in very abstract terms in my recent book: civic ideology develops through dialogue between state leaders and subjects, leaders argue that their authority is legitimate, subjects respond to their arguments, subjects' responses provoke developments in state arguments, and so on.[2] Here I propose that, beginning in the reign of John Hyrcanus I, Hasmonean propaganda was shaped by apocalypticism, but Hasmonean civic ideology was never itself apocalyptic. Hasmonean propagandists deliberately introduced apocalyptic elements in order to accomplish at least two related results: cultivating a sense of common identity and cause between the Hasmonean regime and its apoca-

1. Besides providing fuller accounts of the meanings of and relationship between "civic ideology," "legitimation," "propaganda," and "apocalypticism," the larger project treats evidence from numismatics, archaeology, and a more comprehensive body of literary evidence.

2. Y. M. Gillihan, *Civic Ideology, Organization, and Law in the Rule Scrolls: A Comparative Study of the Covenanters' Sect and Contemporary Voluntary Associations in Political Context* (STDJ 97; Leiden: Brill, 2012).

lyptic critics; and persuading Jews attracted to apocalyptic circles to remain loyal subjects. While certain apocalyptic elements appear in narratives about Judas and Simon Maccabee, the most extensive pro-Hasmonean evidence comes from the time of John Hyrcanus I.

2. Terms: Civic ideology, apocalypticism, propaganda[3]

"Civic ideology" here designates a system of claims about the nature of a state that advance a position on the legitimacy of its authority.[4] As I have shown at length elsewhere, Jewish civic ideology is consistently articulated in language that reflects aspects of Judaism that are sufficiently established, uncontroversial, and familiar to be comprehensible to Jews from a variety of backgrounds.

Apocalypticism puts a particular spin on these common elements of ancient Jewish civic ideology but does not change them fundamentally.[5] First, only special divine revelation, not ordinary means of intellectual effort, provides humans with full understanding of theology, nature, anthropology, political order, history, justice, and human thriving. Second, the contents of divine revelation disclose divinely established patterns in history and Scripture. From an apocalyptic perspective, common values and interests that might lead to dialogue and compromise in other circumstances can look like seductions away from the narrow truth. For these reasons it is unsurprising that apocalyptic civic ideology appears mainly among minority groups that do not wield power, and that it tends to offer guidance on how to endure the evil present in preparation for the righteous future, rather than practical ideas appropriate for governing the diverse population of a complex state.[6]

This assessment seems to be confirmed when we turn to Hasmonean propaganda, especially 1 Maccabees. One of its most salient features is the lack of apocalyptic dualisms. While its narrative tracks progress from an evil era to a time of righteousness, this transition occurs gradually, not with sudden supernatural

3. For a survey of definitions and an account that I find most useful, see R. Marlin, *Propaganda and the Ethics of Persuasion* (Peterborough: Broadview Press, 2002), 16–22. My understanding of the topic benefited from the demand for precision among interlocutors at the Nangeroni conference, and from research on Assyrian propaganda that my colleague Jeffrey L. Cooley generously shared with me. For excellent discussion and bibliography, see Cooley, "Propaganda, Prognostication, and Planets," in A. Lenzi and J. Stökl (eds), *Divination, Politics, and Ancient Near Eastern Empires* (ANEM/MACO; Atlanta: SBL, forthcoming), 1–26, esp. 1–7.

4. The following is based on my earlier analysis in *Civic Ideology*, 75–132.

5. Here I note without arguing for characteristics of apocalypticism that this study assumes. For recent discussion and bibliography, see M. Stone, *Ancient Judaism: New Visions and Views* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011), 79–89.

6. On apocalypticism in alternative civic ideology, see my discussion of Paul's letters and the Covenanters' texts, *Civic Ideology*, 120–6, 135–52, 277–89.

intervention.[7] Where God intervenes, he does so by choosing human agents who do the divine work by normal human means.[8] While God chooses one specific group to lead Israel, the elect Hasmoneans guide an array of Jewish allies with remarkably diverse theologies and approaches to warfare and politics, all of whom are portrayed as essentially righteous.

While not apocalyptic, Hasmonean propaganda contains apocalyptic elements, including those we shall now consider: *veneration of the heroes of Daniel*; *use of Daniel's apocalyptic chronology*; *messianism*; and *veneration of Jewish groups with apocalyptic ideology*. I suggest that affirmation of these elements was intended to circumvent the resistance of apocalyptic critics by presenting Hasmonean claims in critics' own language. At the same time, Hasmonean propaganda stripped these elements of apocalyptic meaning in order to correct and nullify essential claims of their apocalyptic critics.

3. Veneration of the heroes of Daniel

We begin with Hasmonean interest in the book of Daniel.[9] While Daniel was written prior to Hasmonean ascendancy and seems at best indifferent to their efforts, the apocalyptic text provided good materials for an anti-Hasmonean critique.[10] Its depiction of divine deliverance relies entirely on God, at least as far as the violent work goes.

7. E.g. contrast Daniel and 1 Maccabees on the transition from the time of greatest suffering to the era of redemption: in Dan. 12:1-3 the עת צרה/ἡμέρα θλίψις appears to come during the time of Antiochus IV. The transition ends immediately when the archangel Michael intervenes. It climaxes with the resurrection and retribution of a portion of humanity, and affords full benefit to the very few משכלים. In 1 Macc. 9:27 the θλίψις μεγάλη occurs at the death of Judas and is followed by a normal human council at which Jonathan Maccabee is chosen to succeed his brother. Jonathan then initiates successful strategems that bring revenge upon local enemies and complete the Seleucids' defeat. Supernatural intervention is visible only by interpreting normal phenomena as indicators of divine partisanship: Jonathan succeeds militarily (even as he continues the Hasmonean policy of fighting on the Sabbath) (9:43-49); the high priest Alcimus falls ill with paralysis after he gives orders to tear down the inner wall of the temple (9:54-57); and peace, prosperity, and international renown gradually accrue to Judea and all its inhabitants (9:73-10:47).

8. See esp. 1 Macc. 5:55-62, 67.

9. For overlapping points between 1 Maccabees and Daniel, see Goldstein, *1 Maccabees*, 42–54.

10. On the possibility that in Dan. 11:34 יעזרו עזר מעט refers to the Hasmoneans, see J. Collins, *Daniel* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1994). 386. Use of Daniel among groups with anti-Hasmonean ideology is most visible in the sectarian texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls. See the essays by L. Grabbe, G. Boccacini, L. Stuckenbruck, and J. Hobbins in J. Collins et al. (eds), *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, 2 vols (Leiden: Brill, 2000, 2001); also L. Grabbe, "The Seventy-Weeks Prophecy (Daniel 9:24-27) in Early

Despite obvious ideological disagreement with Daniel, 1 Maccabees venerates its heroes in Mattathias's farewell speech: Daniel and his companions are named in a very short list of ancestral heroes whose deeds provide an example to those resisting the Seleucids (2:51-60). Arguably these two verses (2:59-60) accurately summarize Daniel's themes: because they were faithful (πιστεύσαντες), Hananias, Azarias, and Misael were saved from fire; because he was innocent (ἁπλότης), Daniel was rescued from the lion's den. The implication is obvious: because true innocence and fidelity exist among those who joined the Hasmoneans, divine deliverance will come to them.

On its own the inclusion of Daniel's heroes might be subversive enough, but the list of heroes in Mattathias's speech (1 Macc. 2:51-60) looks deliberately fashioned to make clear that the heroes of Daniel belong to the values and program of the Hasmoneans, not to the apocalyptic book. First, Daniel's heroes appear last in the list of ancestors; arguably this gives them pride of place (2:51-60). Their virtues of πίστις and ἁπλότης form an *inclusio* with those of the first-named ancestors, Abraham and Joseph (2:52-53). By the time Daniel and his companions appear in Mattathias's speech, their virtues are conditioned by preceding material so that one at least assumes their approval, if not performance, of zealous violence. In the present crisis their πίστις would bring them to arms; emulating their ἁπλότης requires Caleb-like defiance of those who would transgress God's command out of fear, zealously obeying the command to slay like Phineas, Joshua, and Elijah, and showing mercy only when the law requires it, like David.

These two short sentences in Mattathias's speech venerate the book of Daniel by appealing to its colorful narratives, confirming its heroes' famous virtues and deeds, including the heavenly visions for which Elijah and Daniel were known; it even ranks them next to the greatest patriarchs in status. But the overall message of the book of Daniel has been so fully rejected that it seems fair to say that its heroes are marshaled into 1 Maccabees' exemplary host by forced conscription. Their enlistment for the Hasmonean cause is strongly propagandistic, for it seems intended to mislead the audience by exaggerating the extent to which the Hasmoneans shared the values of Daniel and its devoted readers.

4. Danielic chronology: Restoration after seven years of evil

While the narratives in the first six chapters of Daniel offer paradigmatic examples of retribution for piety and idolatry, the visions of Daniel's apocalypse provide more detailed predictions of what wise pious pacifists can anticipate, including calculations of time that are both specific and malleable enough to be appropriated

Jewish Interpretation," in C. Evans et al. (eds), *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 601–4; and W. Adler, "The Apocalyptic Survey of History Adapted by Christians: Daniel's Prophecy of 70 Weeks," in J. VanderKam and W. Adler (eds), *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996) 201–38.

easily. Among early Jewish audiences, the most commonly appropriated was Daniel 9:24-27, which famously transforms Jeremiah's oracle about seventy years of exile (Jer. 29:10) into a prediction about a 490-year period that ends with divine intervention that destroys evil and ushers in an era of eternal righteousness. The apocalyptic elements that appear in Hasmonean propaganda are abstract: God will bring about restoration after seven evil years, and this period will be interrupted in the middle by some event. The fact that the connection between Daniel's prophecy and details in Hasmonean propaganda must be figured out by the audience seems like good reason for questioning whether the Hasmoneans actually used this material, let alone whether it was propaganda in the same sense as their use of Daniel's characters. Nevertheless it is worth considering, since at least five ancient sources—four preserved in Josephus, and 1 Maccabees—appear to have incorporated Daniel's scheme into descriptions of accession and succession in the Hasmonean dynasty. As I will argue, these sources seem to me to have originated both in pro- and anti-Hasmonean circles.

In 1 Maccabees, Alcimus attains the high priesthood in year 151 (7:1-9).[11] Judas dies in the second month of year 152 (9:3-27), bringing "great tribulation" such as had not been seen "since the prophet appeared to them" (v. 27).[12] In the second month of year 153 Alcimus attempts to remove an inner wall in the temple, a profound act of impiety (9:54-57). Alcimus dies that year mute, paralyzed, and unable to see the plan through. In the seventh month of year 160, during Sukkot, Jonathan Maccabee becomes high priest (10:21). This sequence puts Jonathan's accession at about the end of a seven-year vacancy of the high priesthood, which alone might suggest that Jonathan's accession fulfills Daniel's prediction of restoration at the end of seven evil years. One might correlate the cutting of an anointed one in Daniel 9:26 with the death of Judas or Alcimus (1 Macc. 9:18-27; 9:54-57), and the "strong covenant" that the invading foreign king makes with "many" in Daniel 9:27 with the Seleucids' alliances with the Jewish enemies of the Hasmoneans at this time (1 Macc. 7; 9:58-59).

Josephus preserves four accounts of Hasmonean succession that seem to reflect the Danielic chronology.[13] Two seem pro-Hasmonean and reflect the same chronological schema as 1 Maccabees; the others are anti-Hasmonean. The first account appears at *Ant.* 12.414-434; 13.46. Alcimus reigns for four years, then God strikes him dead for plotting to tear down the sanctuary wall. Judas succeeds him as high priest and holds the office for three years (12.434). When Judas dies the office is vacant for four years, then Jonathan is inaugurated (13.46). Many scholars detect confusion here, but it seems to me that Josephus has preserved the same sort of generalized elements from the Danielic chronology that appear in 1 Maccabees: Judas or Alcimus can be read as the anointed one who is cut off in Daniel 9:26. The

11. *Contra* Adler, "Apocalyptic Survey," 211 n. 36, who puts Alcimus's accession in year 153, missing the reference to his installation in Ch. 7.

12. καὶ ἐγένετο θλῖψις μεγάλη ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ, ἥτις οὐκ ἐγένετο ἀφ᾽ ἧς ἡμέρας οὐκ ὤφθη προφήτης αὐτοῖς. Who is the prophet? The ambiguity allows speculation, including Daniel.

13. For discussion see Adler, "Apocalyptic Survey," 208–12.

seven-year period begins with Alcimus's accession. His alliance with Bacchides is the "strong covenant"; it ends in the middle of the seven years when Alcimus dies, leaving the temple without an officiating high priest and effectively desolate. As in 1 Maccabees, Jonathan's accession marks the end of the seven-year evil era (Dan. 9:27). In contradiction to 1 Maccabees, Jonathan's accession is a restoration of the Hasmonean high priesthood, not its inauguration, since Judas is the first Hasmonean to hold the office. Perhaps here this detail is intended to appeal to Judas's popularity among Jews who opposed later Hasmonean high priests: they did not usurp an office but reclaimed one rightfully gained from the beginning.

The second pro-Hasmonean account appears in a summary of the high priests and rulers in *Ant*. 20.237-38. This account passes over Judas and draws a direct line of succession from Onias III to Alcimus, whose death after three years marks the beginning of seven years without a high priest. Read from the Danielic perspective, Jonathan Maccabee's inauguration comes after the final seven evil years, as in 1 Maccabees.[14] Unlike 1 Maccabees and the source behind *Ant.* 12–13, Josephus's source in *Ant*. 20 seems interested in the 490-years Daniel 9:24-27. It states that the Babylonian captivity lasts seventy years, followed by a 414-year period of the restored high priesthood that lasts until the reign of Anthiochus V Eupator, c. 163–161 BCE (*Ant*. 20.233-34). By this calculation, about 484 years had passed by the time Alcimus became high priest, placing his tenure exactly at the beginning of the evil seven years. He holds office for three years and then dies, presumably at about the halfway point in the evil years. At his death the seven-year priestless period begins; it seems to include both the final years of the evil age and the first years of the age of restoration.[15] Perhaps a Hasmonean propagandist invented the chronology in *Ant*. 20 in the context of discussions with subjects who took Daniel's prophecy seriously. Alternatively, it may have been used to furnish pro-Hasmonean subjects with answers to critics who claimed that the Hasmoneans' rule fulfilled the prophecy about the evil seven years.

Taken together, these five accounts of Hasmonean leadership may preserve an ongoing process of claim and counter-claim that appeared along these lines:

Daniel: after 490 years Israel will be restored; the last seven years will be evil.

Hasmoneans: Jonathan's high priesthood inaugurated restoration after the 490-year period prophesied by Daniel, following the final seven evil years (*Ant*. 20).

(**Anti-Hasmoneans?:** The calculation of time is impossible and Hasmonean priesthood illegitimate.)

14. Alternatively, the length of the periods may reflect interest in organizing Israelite history by jubilees, a practice well attested in late Second Temple literature. The first period that Josephus describes extends from Solomon to the removal of the high priest to Babylon, 466 years, six months, and ten days (*Ant*. 20.231-32).

15. Alternatively the chronology is garbled or Josephus distorted it.

Hasmoneans: Judas actually succeeded Alcimus as high priest, so Jonathan's priesthood continued an established, legitimate line (*Ant*. 12–13).

Anti-Hasmoneans: Daniel predicted an evil ruler in the 483rd year; he is the Hasmonean, Alexander Jannaeus (*BJ* 1; *Ant*. 13).

5. Priest, ruler, prophet: John Hyrcanus I

We now turn to John Hyrcanus I's self-presentation to his subjects. The historical circumstances of Hasmonean consolidation of power were problematic for many reasons. One of the most important is that they too closely resembled the same circumstances that brought the previous high priests, Jason, Menelaus, and Alcimus to power: until Judea's liberation under Simon, all offices came through a foreign king's decision.[16] Other problems were that the Hasmonean high priests, like their predecessors, engaged in battle; their combination of royal and priestly offices is yet another.[17] Such problems generated criticism that, I suggest, prompted John Hyrcanus I to add new apocalyptic elements to Hasmonean propaganda, including elements with messianic themes.[18]

Against the charge that the Hasmoneans were priest-kings, the defense was simply denial, with explanation: Hasmoneans have never been kings. Even when foreign kings honored Hasmoneans with the royal treatment, they were only called "friends" of the king, not Judean royalty nor peers of kings elsewhere. Nowhere does Hasmonean propaganda attempt to refute messianic ideology, nor defend their claim to the high priesthood (with the exception of Hyrcanus's thwarting of the Pharisee Eleazar's assault on his mother's purity by dismissing all Pharisees from his cabinet). The most intriguing aspect of the Hasmonean response is that it does not deny that they are behaving like kings. In fact 1 Maccabees 14:40-45 has Simon do exactly what only a king and no other can do: all documents are written in his name, all assemblies convene in his name, he alone wears purple and gold, and his word is law. No apology is necessary for the Hasmoneans' royal behavior, because their propaganda can appeal to a claim common to apocalypticism: the

16. I.e. Jason and Menelaus by Antiochus IV (2 Macc. 4:7-8, 23-26); Alcimus by Demetrius (1 Macc. 7:9-11); Jonathan Maccabee by Alexander and Demetrius (10:18-21; 11:24-8); Simon by Demetrius (13:35) after unofficial recognition by Jewish acclaim (13:7-8).

17. On opposition to the Hasmoneans among the Covenanters of the DSS, see esp. H. Eshel, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hasmonean State* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 63–89.

18. Messianism, while not inherently apocalyptic, is a common feature of apocalyptic literature and thought. Apocalyptic Jewish groups who had messianic expectations and complaints about Hasmonean policy surely felt discouraged by foreign kings addressing Jonathan and Simon in royal terms, and even more by Simon's apparently willing acceptance of the role, if not title (see esp. 1 Macc. 14:43b-44).

situation is valid only until God sends an emissary to set things aright, perhaps by preparing the way for a royal messiah or, possibly, a new priestly messiah.

When we say that ancient Jews awaited *He That Cometh*, the anointed, we are surely using terms that would have been familiar to the Hasmoneans. But in their propaganda, *He That Cometh* is an anointer, not the anointed. The Hasmoneans make no claims or denials about what will happen when the prophet arises—only that uncertainty will end and Israel's major constitutional offices will be put into correct form. This lack of specificity puts them at an advantage: they have nothing to defend or justify, nor have they any need to debate what will happen when *He That Cometh* comes. Perhaps he will inaugurate a new age; perhaps he will approve of what the Hasmoneans established. Lest anyone suspect this is a dodge to put off critics, 1 Maccabees asserts the same provision in its explanation for why the stones of the defiled temple altar had not yet found a permanent destination. Hasmonean propaganda insists on awaiting the prophet because Israel needs the prophet—how else to resolve at least these two sticky issues, and probably many more?[19]

The brief account in *Ant*. 13.302 says that, on the death of his father John Hyrcanus, Aristobulus I put his mother in prison because his father had left governance of the people to her and, presumably, only the priesthood to him. While Josephus relates Hyrcanus's decision to his sons' character defects, it may have been the case that he had been planning to divide civil governance/royal office from the office of high priest all along. This was, after all, what his critics wanted, both Pharisees and Covenanters, and probably others.

When Hyrcanus went the way of all flesh, disaster fell upon the Hasmonean house: Aristobulus starved his mother to death in prison, executed his brother Antigonus, then died of grief, vomiting blood, all within about a year. The length of the youngest son's, Alexander Jannaeus's, reign (103–76) was doubly impressive, given the amount of Jewish and foreign blood shed in endless strife. But the fate of Antigonus and Aristobulus was well noted by the Covenanters, who also observed that John Hyrcanus had rebuilt the city of Jericho, and occupied the three main constitutional offices of Biblical Israel. Their response, the Testimonia (4Q175), points to Joshua's curse upon the "man of Belial" who rebuild Jericho: "on his firstborn shall he lay its foundation, and on his youngest shall he set up its gates" (4Q175 22–23). The Testimonia goes on to predict the coming of a truly trustworthy prophet whom Israel will heed, and a ruler who will crush the heads of Israel's enemies, and a righteous priesthood whose enemies God will crush. As Hanan Eshel has argued, this seems a cogent rebuke of Hyrcanus's claim to all three offices, especially that of prophet: far from being trustworthy and righteous, he is the evil one, the man of Belial, about whom one of the earliest recorded prophecies was made. The Testimonia may be the final extant statement in an argument over whether the arrangement of Hasmonean authority was legitimate. From the Hasmoneans' perspective, the outcome of the conversation

19. Similarly 1 Macc. 9:27 associates the θλίψις μεγάλη that comes at Judas's death with the absence of prophets in Israel; perhaps this suggests the need for renewal of the office.

was disastrous: in the wake of Aristobulus's and Alexander Jannaeus's reigns, it is hard to imagine whom the prophetic trope could have convinced. This attempt at appropriating apocalyptic elements into Hasmonean propaganda proved marvelously ill-fated.

6. Veneration of resistance groups with apocalyptic ideology

The book of Daniel provides a sort of "inside view" of one non-Hasmonean approach to resisting the Seleucids; 1 Maccabees provides good evidence for a variety of Jewish groups that responded to the crisis of 167 with ideologies and actions that differed quite strongly from those of the Hasmoneans.[20] Hasmonean propaganda dealt with such groups much as it treated the book of Daniel: propagandists venerated opponents and presented the Hasmoneans as their champions. The only groups that 1 Maccabees criticizes outright are those allied with the Seleucids and military leaders who acted independently of the Maccabean leadership. Doubtless some opposing groups had apocalyptic ideologies. The strongest evidence for such a group appears in 1 Maccabees 2:29-41, in the account of certain "seekers of righteousness and judgment." Having retreated to the wilderness, when surrounded by Seleucid forces on the Sabbath they refused to defend themselves, preferring to die in "innocence" (ἁπλότης, 2:37) than to transgress the commandment. Perhaps, like Daniel, the "seekers" anticipated that God would deliver them miraculously in response to piety; unlike Daniel, the narrative suggests that they did not object to warfare per se, only to violating the Sabbath. In any case, one thousand persons were slaughtered on the holy day. Half a century or so later, 1 Maccabees recounts the massacre not as evidence that the "seekers'" refusal to fight on the Sabbath was foolish, excessive, or dangerous to the nation, although these options were surely available. Instead the group is treated with sympathy and admiration. In the narrative Mattathias and his friends are the first to receive the gruesome news and the first to mourn. Taking counsel, Mattathias and allies make a hard decision: fighting for the lives and laws of Israel requires fighting on the Sabbath when the enemy attacks (2:39-41).

This story delivers an argument about Hasmonean piety based on an implicit sequence and an explicit limit: originally Mattathias and his allies agreed with the "seekers" and did not fight on the Sabbath at all. The fact that they made the halakhic allowance for defensive fighting on the Sabbath only after the ἀδελφοί were slaughtered suggests that the allowance was to honor and avenge the ἀδελφοί, besides the explicitly stated goals of defending Jewish life and laws more broadly. Limiting Sabbath warfare to defensive fighting and claiming that the halakhic allowance actually promotes the commandments (2:40) reinforces

20. For an overview of modes of resistance, see J. Sievers, *The Hasmoneans and Their Supporters from Mattathias to the Death of John Hyrcanus I* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 21–6. The Hasideans suffer like the "seekers," losing sixty men when the high priest Alcimus exploited their veneration of his office and delivered them to enemies (2:42-48; 7:12-18).

the implied claim that the Hasmoneans agreed with the "seekers" and matched them in devotion to the laws. The impression of agreement intensifies in the immediately following verses. In 2:42, as soon as Mattathias and friends resolve to fight on the Sabbath, τότε συνήχθησαν πρὸς αὐτοὺς συναγωγὴ Ἀσιδαίων, mighty warriors of Israel devoted to the law. It is as though the Maccabees earn the Hasideans' allegiance directly by their decision to fight on the Sabbath. Even more impressively, 2:43 reports καὶ πάντες οἱ φυγαδεύοντες ἀπὸ τῶν κακῶν joined the Maccabees alongside the Hasideans. The description must be intended to suggest the "seekers" who, only a little earlier in the same chapter, fled to the wilderness to escape τὰ κακά (2:30). Apparent survivors of the movement recognize the Maccabean fighters as their champions and accept their decision to fight on the Sabbath as legitimate halakah.[21]

Perhaps this short account was intended to rebut opposition to Hasmonean policy on Sabbath warfare and other policies. It pushed the audience to recall a shared memory, whether true or not, of harmony between leaders in the previous generation. Not only did survivors of the "seekers" and the Hasideans agree with the Maccabees' new halakah on Sabbath warfare, the Maccabees earlier agreed with the "seekers." One could infer an exchange of mutual persuasion proving that, from the beginning, the Hasmoneans listened to and honored the most pious of Judea, including those who anticipated Daniel-like miraculous deliverance as God's response to their piety.

7. Conclusion

In these examples we meet the possibility that some elements of Hasmonean civic ideology developed through engagement with apocalypticism, but Hasmonean civic ideology certainly did not become apocalyptic through the engagement. Its treatment of common apocalyptic figures and themes consistently downplays or winnows away their apocalyptic character; they do not burn with the dazzling fire of ultimate revelation but come into view bearing the humbler lustre of theological commonplaces found throughout the Torah, prophets, and historical works. Most importantly, these newly nonapocalyptic elements now consistently serve to deliver major themes of Hasmonean civic ideology: the Hasmoneans are divinely elected, pious, utterly devoted to Torah and temple, just in all domestic and foreign affairs, guarantors of liberty, promoters of peace, facilitators of unprecedented prosperity.

1 Maccabees refutes the charges of apocalypticists less by confrontation, more by deflection and neutralization. I am sympathetic to Goldstein's intuition about the author's suspicion of Daniel. Doubtless he regarded Daniel as wrong and wished to counter its claims. But the propagandist's main assault on Daniel was

21. Note that fighting on the Sabbath is only mentioned once more, in 1 Macc. 9:32-49, when Jonathan routs Bacchides's force. The halakah is not often needed, but when used, Jewish efforts succeed.

much more obvious and efficient than embedding nuggets of refutory evidence in a long narrative. Instead, 1 Maccabees subverted Daniel's apocalyptic critique quite directly by conscripting the prophet as an ally to the Hasmonean cause. Arguments for a regime's legitimacy are most persuasive, after all, when they stress that subjects and rulers have much in common, not when they insist that subjects are wrong.[22] This point was not lost on Hasmoneans in the late second century BCE as they appropriated apocalyptic motifs to create the appearance of a common set of values, a common sense of identity, a common set of enemies, and a common interest in shepherding the fledgling Jewish state toward divinely promised stability and prosperity. If successful, such propaganda would cultivate a common civic ideology even among subjects who rejected Hasmonean authority and tactics, in whole or in part. Its eminently desirable practical consequence, social and political stability, would prove all too elusive.

22. On this theory in antiquity, see Aristotle, *Pol.* 1313a 34-b 9.

Response to Gillihan

Kenneth Atkinson

Yonder Moynihan Gillihan explores how apocalypticism shaped Hasmonean propaganda beginning with the reign of John Hyrcanus I. His essay proposes that Hasmonean civic ideology was never itself apocalyptic. However, he suggests that Hasmonean propagandists deliberately introduced apocalyptic elements into their narratives to cultivate a common identity between the Hasmonean regime and its apocalyptic critics, and to persuade Jews attracted to apocalyptic circles to remain their loyal subjects. Gillihan proposes that these changes were largely compelled by new historical circumstances, and not by theological convictions the Hasmoneans held from the beginning of their rule. He focuses on the following areas of Hasmonean propaganda he suggests contain apocalyptic elements: the veneration of the heroes of Daniel; the use of Daniel's apocalyptic chronology; messianism; and the veneration of Jewish groups with apocalyptic ideology. This review comments on some aspects of Gillihan's thesis, particularly those that involve Hyrcanus I.[1]

1. Veneration of the heroes of Daniel

Gillihan compares the use of Daniel and 1 Maccabees by critics and supporters of the Hasmoneans. The allusions or descriptions of the early Hasmoneans in these books, particularly Simon and Hyrcanus I, provide fitting examples of the different Jewish attitudes towards this family. Gillihan suggests the opponents of the Hasmoneans used apocalyptic elements in the Book of Daniel.[2] He believes the Book of Daniel effectively downplays the early and most impressive achievements of the Hasmoneans, namely their alliances with powerful nations. In contrast to the valor and military might of the first Hasmoneans, the Book of Daniel's protagonists obtain their successes through their strict fidelity to the law, their pacifism, and their aversion to politics. Although the writer of 1 Maccabees explicitly mentions the Hasmoneans, the book has little to say about Hyrcanus I. It concludes with a brief description of the elevation of his father, Simon, as the nation's political and religious leader and a few references to Hyrcanus I.[3]

1. For earlier presentations of some aspects of his essay, see further Yonder Moynihan Gillihan, *Civic Ideology, Organization, and Law in the Rule Scrolls: A Comparative Study of the Covenanters' Sect and Contemporary Voluntary Associations in Political Context* (STDJ 97; Leiden: Brill, 2012).

2. For the Hasmoneans in the Book of Daniel, see further John Collins, *Daniel* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1994), esp. 377–94; Jonathan Goldstein, *1 Maccabees* (AB 41; New Haven: Anchor Yale, 1975), esp. 44–51.

3. See 1 Macc. 16.

Josephus offers a different portrayal of Hyrcanus I. He believed that Hyrcanus I was the most pious and competent of all the Hasmonean rulers.[4] He exaggerates the achievements of Hyrcanus I to portray him as the most successful member of his family.[5] Josephus also carefully rearranges his sources to emphasize Hyrcanus I's combination of piety and military might. He emphasizes these aspects to portray his reign as a Hasmonean "Golden Age" during which God blessed the nation with an unprecedented expansion like the time of David.

Gillihan notes that the author of 1 Maccabees 2:51-60 attempts to show that the heroes of the Book of Daniel shared the values of the Hasmoneans. However, the writer of 1 Maccabees did not make use of the apocalyptic sections of this biblical book to support them. The problem the author faced was that Hyrcanus I, unlike the figure of Daniel and many of the heroes cited in the Book of Daniel, was a violent warrior. In his *War*, Josephus highlights Hyrcanus's gift of prophecy.[6] He even claims that Hyrcanus I foresaw that dangers that would follow the transformation of the Hasmonean political leadership into a monarchy.[7] He also claims that God granted Hyrcanus I three of the greatest privileges: the rule of the nation, the office of high priest, and the gift of prophesy.[8] The accounts of Josephus suggest that the type of Hasmonean propaganda Gillihan cites was fairly widespread. For Josephus, the militarism of Hyrcanus I was justified since it had divine sanction. Despite his use of violence, Hyrcanus I, for Josephus, shared many of the values of the figure of Daniel. His critique of Hyrcanus I, when read in light of works such as the Book of Daniel and 1 Maccabees, suggest that there was some disagreement over the validity of Hasmonean rule. The evidence Gillihan cites suggests that the new historical circumstances that accompanied the rise of the Hasmonean dynasty led to an extensive use of propaganda both to support and oppose this ruling family.

2. Danielic chronology: Restoration after seven years of evil

Gillihan explores the use of Jeremiah's oracle about the seventy years of exile (Jer. 29:10) in Daniel 9:24-27 in connection with the Hasmoneans.[9] He suggests the Hasmoneans used this oracle to delineate history into a 490-year period

4. For Josephus's praise of Hyrcanus, see *War* 1.54–69; *Ant.* 13.230-300.

5. For Josephus's portrayals of Hyrcanus I, see Clemens Thoma, "John Hyrcanus I As Seen By Josephus and Other Early Jewish Sources," in Fausto Parente and Joseph Sievers (eds), *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period* (StPB 41; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994), 127–40.

6. *War* 1.67–9.

7. *War* 1.68.

8. *War* 1.67–9; *Ant.* 13.299-300.

9. For the importance of these traditions in Second Temple Literature, see further Michael E. Stone, *Ancient Judaism: New Visions and Views* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011), 60–75.

that culminated with a final seven-year phase of suffering. Gillihan suggests that both the supporters and the opponents of the Hasmoneans connected them with this biblical oracle. In his discussion, Gillihan explores several ancient sources preserved in Josephus (*Ant.* 12.414-3; 13.46, 301; 20.237-8; *War* 1.70), and 1 Maccabees (1 Macc. 7:1-9; 9:3-27, 54-57; 10:21; 12:1) that he believes describe the Hasmonean dynasty. Through an examination of the uses of the Danielic chronology in Josephus and 1 Maccabees, Gillihan proposes that the traditions embedded in these texts provide an invaluable witness to a longstanding debate over the legitimacy of the Hasmonean dynasty.

The Qumran text 4QApocryphon of Jeremiah C[e] (4Q390) may provide additional support for Gillihan's argument that there was a lengthy process of claim and counter-claim to interpret the rise and leadership of the Hasmoneans.[10] The author of this composition, like 1 Maccabees and Josephus, used biblical texts to interpret the Hasmonean dynasty. The writer of 4Q390 cited Daniel 9:24-27 to date the last historical stage to the period of the Hasmonean revolt.[11] Hanan Eshel suggests this Qumran author believed the final redemption would come after the end of the 490-year period. The traditions in 4Q390, when read in light of the parallels in Josephus and 1 Maccabees, suggest that many Jews used calculations based on Daniel 9:24-27 and Jeremiah 29:10 to explain contemporary events and to determine the final age of history during the Hasmonean period. Lester Grabbe notes that these traditions regarding Daniel 9 arose during the Maccabean Revolt, and continued to be used as a basis for apocalyptic speculation for two centuries until the fall of the temple in 70 CE.[12] The evidence Gillihan cites suggests that the Hasmoneans too used such biblical traditions to justify their reign, and to connect their rule with biblical prophecy. This is particularly true for the rule of Hyrcanus I.

10. For the *edition princeps* of *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C*, see Devorah Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI: Parabiblical Texts, Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts* (DJD 30; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), 91–260 (4Q390 is found on pages 235–53 of this volume). An additional copy of a text identified as *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* was published separately. See Mark Smith, "4Q391.4QpapPseudo-Ezekiel," in Magen Broshi et al. (eds), *Qumran Cave 4.XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2* (DJD 19; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 153–93. Because much of the content of 4Q390 is found in texts unassociated with Qumran, this suggests that the heptadic chronology in this document was fairly widespread in the Second Temple period. See further Eibert Tigchelaar, "Classifications of the Collection of Dead Sea Scrolls and the Case of *Apocryphon of Jeremiah C*," *JSJ* 43 (2012): 519–50.

11. See further Hanan Eshel, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hasmonean State* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 25–7; Cana Werman, "Epocs and End-Time: The 490-Year Scheme in Second Temple Literature," *DSD* 13 (2006): 229–55. Similar calculations reflecting a periodization of history are found in the following texts: 1 En. 89:59–90:19 (4Q204–207); 4Q212; 4Q247; 4Q558; 4Q181; 4Q243.

12. Lester L. Grabbe, "The Seventy-Weeks Prophecy (Daniel 9:24-27) in Early Jewish Interpretation," in Craig A. Evans and Shemaryahu Talmon (eds), *The Quest for Context and Meaning* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 604–11.

3. Priest, ruler, and prophet: John Hyrcanus I

Gillihan highlights the special role that John Hyrcanus I played in Hasmonean propaganda and history. According to Josephus, God favored him more than all the Hasmoneans with the gifts of political rule, the high priesthood, and prophecy.[13] Gillihan emphasizes the problematic nature of this portrayal since the reign of his successor, Aristobulus I, was disastrous.

The author of 1 Maccabees suggests that many Jews were uncomfortable with Hasmonean rule. He mentions that it was agreed by "the *Ioudaioi* and the priests that Simon should be their chief and high priest in perpetuity until a true prophet shall arise."[14] The Greek phrase "in perpetuity" does not say anything about the hereditary character of this office. Rather, it implies that Simon could be removed from the high priesthood before his death since the expected prophet presumably could arrive and either assume power or designate another person to replace him.[15] This limitation suggests that the Hasmoneans faced constant opposition to their rule and attempted to use propaganda to highlight their role as God's chosen caretakers of the temple cult.

The successful military campaigns of Hyrcanus I apparently led many Jews to identify him as a prophet chosen by God. Some Jews undoubtedly viewed him as a figure like David: his military expansion of the nation was a sign that God sanctioned the violence of his reign.[16] Josephus likely omitted any messianic speculation about him since any such claims for a Jewish leader would have been a sensitive issue among the Romans in the aftermath of 70 CE.[17] However, Josephus's accounts suggest that many supporters of Hyrcanus I likely made such assertions about him to justify his actions, as well as to support his family's rule.

Yet, as Gillihan observes, the traditions preserved in 4QTestimonia (4Q175) suggest that some Jews rejected such polemics and refused to accept the tradition that Hyrcanus I was the ideal prophet and priest despite his successful military conquests.[18] This evidence in Second Temple literature of traditions that justified

13. *War* 1.68-9; *Ant.* 299-300.

14. 1 Macc. 14:41.

15. The expectation of a future prophet is not new, but is mentioned in connection with the cleansing of the temple by Judas in 1 Macc. 4:46. See also the treatment of the sacred stones and the construction of a new altar and holy vessels by Judas in 1 Macc. 9:41-51.

16. *Ant.* 13.254–8.

17. Josephus records several messianic pretenders during the first century CE and hints that messianic beliefs likely motivated many Jews to revolt against Rome in 66 CE. See further John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (2nd edn; Anchor Bible Reference Library; New York: Doubleday, 2010), 215–28.

18. See further Eshel, *Dead Sea Scrolls,* 80–3.Berthelot suggests that 4QTestimonia criticizes the legitimacy of Hyrcanus as a prophet, a political leader, and a high priest. In contrast, 4QApocryphon of Jeremiah^{b} merely denounces him as a bad ruler and condemns his wars, but only implicitly rebukes him as a false prophet. See Katell Berthelot,

or opposed the reign of Hyrcanus I supports the thesis of Gillihan that Jewish attempts to appropriate apocalyptic elements and other biblical traditions into pro-Hasmonean propaganda during his reign were not entirely successful.

4. Veneration of resistance groups with apocalyptic ideology

Gillihan highlights the importance that resistance groups with apocalyptic ideology played in Hasmonean history. He highlights the change Mattathais made when he concluded that the laws of Israel required Jews to defend themselves on the Sabbath against enemy attacks (1 Macc. 2:39-41). By limiting violence to defensive fighting, the Hasmoneans portrayed themselves as acting in agreement with the "seekers of righteousness and judgment" (1 Macc. 2:29-41). This depiction may also be found in Josephus's accounts of Hyrcanus I. However, Josephus reports that the Seleucid monarch Antiochus VII Sidetes invaded the Hasmonean state and besieged Jerusalem shortly after Hyrcanus I became his country's political leader and high priest.[19] A close reading of Josephus's account reveals that Hyrcanus I returned to Jerusalem to defend the city from Sidetes during the Sabbatical Year.[20] Later, when Hyrcanus I was forced to accompany Sidetes on his Parthian expedition, Josephus claims that he refused to fight so he could celebrate Pentecost.[21] Both accounts are highly misleading and suggest that Josephus has preserved Hasmonean propaganda that was written to justify the actions of Hyrcanus I and to portray him as a pious high priest.

5. Conclusion

Gillihan's essay does an excellent job in highlighting the important role that propaganda played in the Hasmonean dynasty. His claim that some elements of Hasmonean civic ideology developed through engagement with apocalypticism is supported by the contents of Josephus and several Dead Sea Scrolls. This literature suggests there was a conscious effort to downplay apocalyptic elements to portray the Hasmoneans as divinely elected, pious, and strict observers of the Torah. The reign of Hyrcanus I in particular supports many of Gillihan's arguments,

"4QTestimonia as a Polemic Against the Prophetic Claims of John Hyrcanus," in Kristin de Troyer and Armin Lange (eds), *Prophecy After The Prophets?: The Contribution of the Dead Sea Scrolls to the Understanding of Biblical and Extra-Biblical Prophecy* (Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 99–106.

19. Sidetes reigned from 138 to 129 BCE. See further Ehling, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der späten Seleukiden,* 200–30.

20. Because the Sabbatical Year occurred from October 135 BCE to October 134 BCE, the siege started sometime before October 135 BCE, since the Sabbatical Year did not start until after Hyrcanus I began his siege of Dok.

21.

namely that Hasmonean propaganda was shaped by apocalypticism but that Hasmonean civic ideology was never apocalyptic. However, the Hasmoneans made deliberate use of some apocalyptic elements to foster a common identity to help them maintain power. Gillihan is correct to emphasize that the new historical circumstances at the time of Hyrcanus I led to the use of apocalyptic elements in Hasmonean propaganda. This suggests that that Hasmoneans were not the forceful family as depicted in Second Temple literature. Rather, they were a dynasty that managed to change and adapt to the new historical circumstances in Syria to unite their subjects under their rule. They accomplished this by portraying themselves as divinely chosen to lead their nation until God's true ruler and prophet appeared.

7

Some Afterthoughts

Michael E. Stone

I made many pages of notes during this meeting, but I fear they will not help me greatly in the task of giving this retrospective overview. I trust that some of the presenters whose work I do not discuss in detail will forgive me. In the framework of the time and space given, and due to the diversity of the subjects discussed, I found it impossible to deal with them all and I have given free rein to my own proclivities. "The Apocalyptic Worldview" is a challenging topic and "The Seleucid and Hasmonean Periods" is a difficult brief. Our consideration starts in the obscurity of the Seleucid period and gradually emerges into light with the Hasmoneans.

One issue that came up repeatedly during the meeting is that of the definition of "apocalyptic worldview." Lester Grabbe raised problems with the generally accepted definitions, particularly in that they do not lay enough stress on revelation of knowledge and perpetuate the standard assumption of apocalyptic as an outcome of crisis. Particularly in the course of the discussions, previously neat categories became ragged, or at least considerably nuanced; yet no consensus about a re-definition was reached.[1]

What came through to me most clearly as I reviewed the discussion was an *aporia* as to what apocalyptic is and what a worldview is (the latter a subject interestingly discussed by Anathea Portier-Young). Only if "apocalyptic worldview" is understood can the question of the relationship between apocalypticism and the Maccabean Revolt, for example, be considered sensibly (Oegema). Then, the question about the type of relationship between the two, which lurks in the background of much of the discussion, can be considered. Pierluigi Piovanelli in his paper, considering the later apocalypses of the first century CE, argued that they reflect popular feeling and not just the ideas of extremist groups. I would add the broad spread of apocalypses in the languages of the Jews of the period, including Greek, the diversity implied by the existence not just of apocalypses

1. For the standard current view, see John J. Collins, "Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre," *Semeia*, 14 (Chico, CA: Society of Biblical Literature, 1979), 1–20.

from the Land of Israel but also from the diaspora, the Jewish translations of Aramaic texts into Greek, and other features, buttress this view. It is my particular brief, however, to concentrate on the short papers.

Vicente Dobroruka raised two issues that are, once more, very timely. First, he highlights the role played by ancient mythological patterning in apocalyptic historical structures. Second, he returns energetically to the more specific matter of Persian influence on Second Temple Judaism. In that, he draws to our attention once more a series of problems that were last considered deeply by the *religionsgeschichtliche Schule* a century ago. In the background of the issue of Persian influence lie weighty specific issues. These include:

1. the interpretation of Daniel 2 and 7, the sequence of metals and kingdoms, and the highly influential four metals series;
2. the question of Greek influence on Jewish material in the Second Temple period, a subject sadly neglected of late;
3. the question of Iranian influence on Greek culture from the fifth century on, and thus not only direct Iranian influence on Second Temple Judaism, but also the transmission to it of Iranian patterns that the Greeks had absorbed in earlier centuries.

There is no doubt that Daniel is drawing on old traditions. The series of gold, silver, bronze, and iron must be related to the spread of ironwork in the early first millennium BCE. In Daniel, clearly, the metals are related to a four kingdoms pattern that is repeated twice in Chapters 2 and 7. Swain, years ago, suggested that the four metals connection was Persian, and old, with one striking detail shared by the *Zand i Vohuman Yasn* and Daniel 7.[2] That a mixed fourth metal—Daniel calls it iron mixed with clay—occurs in both sources is indeed striking and Dobroruka rightly stresses this anew. Admittedly, in Iranian sources, this is only attested in the Pahlavi books, edited towards the end of the first millennium CE, but arguments can be adduced to show it may be old. Its adoption by Daniel, we may remark, may in part be connected with the love of such numerical patterns in apocalyptic historiography. Other examples of this are the seventy years, seven weeks, etc. and also the divisions of the historical age into twelve and even ten parts.[3]

The occurrence in *Zand I Vohuman Yasn* is striking, since both there and in Daniel 7 we have mixed iron in one form or another. A relationship of some sort seems rather plausible. The problem is exactly that which Vicente Dobroruka pointed out: can we assume that there was an early form of this Pahlavi work? I might add another problem as well: that, even if there was such an ancient work, we are fairly ignorant about what Iranian religion was in the areas of the Parthian empire close to the land of Israel, but we can be sure it was not identical with

2. J. W. Swain (1940), "The Theory of Four Monarchies – Opposition History Under the Roman Empire," *CP*, 25: 1–21.

3. Michael E. Stone (2011), *Ancient Judaism: New Visions and Views* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans), 59–89.

Zoroastrianism as we know it from the Avesta and the Pahlavi books, and we have no idea how such a notion might have reached Daniel. Moreover, even if the *Zand I Vohuman Yasn* contains ancient traditions, why assume that they are older than Daniel and that they did not derive from it?

Here I will not summarize arguments found *in extenso* in Dobroruka's paper. Yet, the questions he implies about roles of Iranian, Greek, and Hellenistic culture, literature, and religion in Hellenized Palestine are extremely weighty and this subject, including its implications for Jewish and Hellenistic relations, has been neglected in recent years.

Årstein Justnes talked most interestingly about the expansion of the corpus of Danielic literature. This brings out strikingly the prominence of Daniel, actually an extra-biblical figure (despite דנאל Ezek. 14:14, 20, 28:3), as a pseudepigraphic author. The picture gained from the Enochic corpus, of varied writings centered around one figure, is also to be found in the Daniel literature. Intriguingly, both these corpora are rather early and the existence of the Daniel corpus undermines the apparent uniqueness of the Enochic. In his critique of Årstein Justnes's remarks, Joseph Angel argues that 4Q246 is undated, and he doubts the linguistic similarities between it and Daniel. I would myself urge careful consideration of the complexity of Danielic tradition and reassessment of the role of canonical Daniel, a set of problems made evident decades ago by the Qumran Nabonidus document. What emerges, once more, is the complexity of the apocalyptic and associated traditions from early in the Second Temple period. This is a very timely caution.

Guided by my own special interests, let me continue. Daniel Machiela dealt again with the Aramaic corpus from Qumran.[4] Correctly, he observes that the very fact of books being in Aramaic does not guarantee any particular coherence of content between them. He does remark, following Florentino García Martínez, that they are of a predominantly "apocalyptic character." He makes the appropriate remarks on this concentration of Aramaic texts, earlier, on the whole, than Hebrew extra-biblical documents, though this is far from a hard and fast rule. He argues that the use of Aramaic diminished as the result of a shift to Hebrew, ideologically motivated, in the Hasmonean period.

I find little to disagree with here, but have a certain caveat to express. It is indeed striking that a large number of Aramaic texts are rather early, and it is equally striking that of this early Aramaic corpus, the major part has apocalyptic tendencies (disregarding *pro tem* our earlier remarks on the definitional problem, though it plagues Machiela too). If the Qumran find reflects a real shift in the use of the languages, then we must hedge our statements with the following explicitly conscious statement. The corpus we have may be either (or both) ideologically tendentious or purely a result of archaeological chance. After all the Chronicler's

4. See Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra (eds), *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence, 30 June–2 July 2008* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, 94; Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2010).

work, Ecclesiastes, Proverbs, indeed all the post-exilic biblical literature[5] is in Hebrew and there is no reason to think that Hebrew, which was anyway the language of the national tradition, had disappeared or fallen into desuetude.

The issue of the languages used by the Jews in Judea at various times and the relationship between them needs further clarification, but it is evident that it was not an either/or situation, but a question of who used which of the two languages, when, and in which context. Machiela does not raise the issue of bilingualism. This said, the idea that the increased number of Hebrew compositions was a result of the events of the day (whether ideologically explicit or not) is a reasonable hypothesis at the present stage of knowledge.

The shared features of the early texts may perhaps be better viewed from the perspective of their period of composition than of their language. As well, the paucity of the finds of Hebrew apocalypses later on might be regarded as correlated with the developing ideology of the Qumran,[6] or even of the broader Essene "wing" of Judaism. It is the absence of Hebrew apocalypses, not the presence of Aramaic ones that is striking.

In conclusion, the papers were all worthy of consideration and through that we may highlight unclear definitions and hidden assumptions, which to me was the chief achievement of the conference and can only benefit the participants and the field in general.

[Since the above was written, I have had occasion to read Jason M. Silverman (2012), *Persepolis and Jerusalem: Iranian Influence on the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic* (London: T&T Clark). It is not certain to me that Dr. Silverman has proved his case, but his book is timely and will combine with Vicente's work to return the question of Iranian influence to the debate. Qumran will have to be included in any future discussion of this.]

5. Except Persian official documents included in Ezra.

6. Observe Shemaryahu Talmon's view that the Qumran sect regarded itself as still living in the biblical period: "The 'Dead Sea Scrolls' or 'The Community of the Renewed Covenant'?" in W. G. Dever and J. E. Wright (eds), Echoes of Many Texts: Essays Honoring Lou H. Silberman on His Eightieth Birthday (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press), 1997.

Part IV

CONCLUSIONS

Perspectives on The Apocalyptic Worldview in The Hasmonean Period

Lester L. Grabbe

The purpose of this essay is to summarize some of the main points made by contributors and comment on them, with the aim of trying to bring various thoughts and points together and, where possible, draw attention to points of consensus arising out of the essays and the oral interaction with them. I do this under several themes that arose from the papers and the discussion of them. Erich Gruen gave an overall response to the main papers, and Michael Stone did the same for the short papers. It is not my purpose to displace their valuable comments; on the contrary, my essay here presupposes the points made by them. Yet I also seek to integrate their comments into the discussion and highlight them.[1]

Question of definition

I gave the title of the conference as "The Seleucid and Hasmonean Periods and the Apocalyptic Worldview," but left open the interpretation of this title: people could make their own assessment of what was meant by "apocalyptic," "worldview," or any of the other terms. A number wrote on the topic without discussing definitions, but others asked what was meant by the terms. Anathea Portier-Young, for example, asked about the significance of "worldview" and devoted her article to a discussion of it. She noted that worldview was carried by a variety of social media, not just literature; unfortunately, most of what we have on the subject from antiquity is the literature. Apart from the occasional iconographic remains,

1. References to essays in the present volume are referred to by the surname of the author in small caps. Other references (with the name in normal type) are either to the discussion (in which case there is no reference) or bibliography (which is given in the footnote).

we are left to deduce what we can from the few writings that have been preserved, however unsatisfactory this might be.

Although I raised some queries about the definitions being used, I did not attempt new definitions myself, as Gruen rightly points out. My aim was to show that some of the widely used definitions have difficulties with them, in some cases raised right from the start of their proposal. Probably the greatest consensus has been around the genre of "apocalypse,"[2] and the discussion and the attempt to define it have been helpful; however, some elements of the definition have been queried, rightly in my view: must it have a heavenly mediator? must it have an eschatology that transcends death? must it exclude a whole variety of writings that many would see as apocalypses? why is so much of the content of so many apocalyptic writings missing from the definition? Indeed, no explanation was given as to how this definition was arrived at. Many would agree that the "Isaiah apocalypse" (Isa. 24–27) is an apocalypse, and I have argued the same for Zechariah 1–8, yet these were not even discussed in the 1979 volume.[3] *Testament of Moses* was also excluded. Daniel Machiela queried the need for a heavenly mediator: although a heavenly mediator is often present, sometimes God himself explains, sometimes the one explaining is a human, sometimes the recipient of the revelation understands the symbols, and sometimes there is no intermediary at all.

Of particular note was the importance of "revelation" to apocalyptic writings (especially commented on by Kampen and Machiela). The standard genre definition begins by noting that an apocalypse is a "revelatory writing," but it does not further define what is revealed. From the definition you might not be aware that an apocalyptic writing often discloses all sorts of esoteric material: the heavenly realm, the heavenly temple and divine throne, the divine plans, the secrets of the cosmos, how the heavenly bodies move, the future, the divine pattern of events, and so on. As Machiela puts it, the apocalyptic passages generally seek to reveal "privileged, divine knowledge and wisdom—the mysteries" (which vicariously place the reader in close contact with the heavenly realm). It is this disclosure of divine knowledge that sets the apocalyptic writing off from other sorts of literature (though, interestingly, not from prophetic writings—see below). But this is precisely why I would want to categorize some writings as apocalypses, contrary to the SBL genre volume.[4]

2. John J. Collins (ed.), *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre* (*Semeia* 14; Atlanta: Scholars, 1979).

3. Stephen L. Cook did argue that Zechariah 1–8 was an apocalypse (*Prophecy and Apocalypticism: The Postexilic Social Setting* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995]). John Collins did discuss the subject in a response to Cook in "The Eschatology of Zechariah," in Lester L. Grabbe and Robert D. Haak (eds), *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic, and their Relationships* (JSPSup 46; London and New York: T&T Clark International, 2003), 74–84.

4. Ibid. See p. 155 for a list of writings that Daniel Machiela would or might include among the "historical apocalypses."

Quibbling over whether a particular writing was an apocalypse or only an "apocalyptic-related" writing was not my main concern, however. I was much more discombobulated over the sharp distinction made between prophecy and apocalyptic: a number of us argue that such cannot be made. My own proposal was that apocalyptic was a form or sub-genre of prophecy. More broadly, I raised in my Introduction this and other issues having to do with the standard definitions. To my surprise, this querying seems to have struck a chord with some of the other contributors. It seems that whatever the shortcomings present in my arguments, they had still resonated—at least to some extent—with the participants. This was somewhat gratifying, since it had been strongly suggested that my views on the question would set the study of apocalypticism back several decades! This was the view of one anonymous reader when I submitted an article to *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* in the 1980s which raised some of these same questions. Such a comment was both flattering and disconcerting: flattering that my influence was seen to be so great! but disconcerting that it was thought to have such a baleful effect if published; fortunately, the editors did not accept that reader's view and the article appeared in 1989.[5]

One issue commented on was whether there was one "apocalyptic worldview." Several expressed the view that there was more than one apocalyptic worldview. Lorenzo DiTommaso very much disagreed with this assessment, arguing (in agreement with Gerbern Oegema) that there was a single apocalyptic worldview:

> This does not deny that there are different *types* of apocalypticism (historical and otherworldly, like Daniel and the earliest Enochic literature), or that it is expressed in different *modes* (biblical and secular). The *form* of the worldview in one historical period or culture can also be quite distinctive when compared to forms in other periods or cultures. Consider mediaeval apocalypticism … a shared set of eschatological motifs that either originated or developed their typical features after the fourth century CE … However, the axioms that underwrite it are identical to those that underwrite the other forms.

Causes and social setting of the apocalyptic worldview

One of the points made in my introductory essay was that the apocalypses and related writings were not necessarily the product of crisis or traumatic situations, nor necessarily of apocalyptic or millennial movements; conversely, crisis situations and millennial movements do not necessarily produce apocalypses or the like. I had literature primarily in mind, but I would apply the conclusion more broadly to the apocalyptic worldview. Gruen seems to agree with this. Also,

5. Grabbe, "The Social Setting of Early Jewish Apocalypticism," *JSP*, 4 (1989): 27–47 (cf. also Grabbe, *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian: Vol. I: Persian and Greek Periods; Vol. II: Roman Period* [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992. British edition in one volume; London: SCM, 1994], 107–10).

Portier-Young, if I understand her correctly, seems to accept that the apocalyptic worldview is not just the product of crisis (or "limit") situations: at least, although she does not seem to state this explicitly, the last part of her article seems to be groping toward that conclusion. For example, although some of the novels (e.g. Tobit) have apocalyptic elements, they are not apocalypses. Yet they seem to have been widely read, not because of a crisis but because of opportunities for peace and quiet and the leisure afforded by a certain prosperity.

This also seems broadly to be Gabriele Boccaccini's perspective. I agree with him that many Jewish apocalypses or related writings can be related to divisions in Jewish society, but is this the origin of apocalypses as such? What about non-Jewish apocalypses, of which a number are known from the ancient Near East?[6] We also have the well-documented apocalypses and related writings from the medieval period, which Lorenzo DiTommaso has been working on,[7] but these seem to have nothing to do with divisions in Jewish society. As already mentioned above and discussed in more detail below, I also fully agree with Boccaccini that crisis events do not necessarily produce apocalypses. On the other hand, when there is an apocalyptic tradition well established in a community (as there clearly was with the Jewish community at this time)[8], a crisis situation may well serve to generate apocalypses or the like. Boccaccini suggests that the invasion of Tigranes produced no apocalypses. I am not sure we can be so dogmatic: perhaps they were created in response to this crisis but have not been preserved, or perhaps we just have not made the right identification between the preserved apocalypses and the Tigranes invasion. In addition, some aspects of Boccaccini's suggestion look remarkably close to the positions of Otto Plöger and Paul Hanson (which I have critiqued at length—see below).[9]

Paul Mandel draws our attention to the paradox that it is a *human* interpreter who mediates the divine messages, and discusses comparisons between the apocalyptic interpreter, the rabbinc *doresh*, and the Mesopotamian diviner. As the respondent (Kenneth Atkinson) accepted, this is a valid consideration even though the rabbinic world is long after the Second Temple apocalypses, and the Mesopotamian materal is much earlier. This time gap by itself does not rule out a valid comparison. Even if there was no organic connection—even if there was

6. Some of these are discussed, with bibliography in Grabbe, *A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period 2: The Coming of the Greeks: The Early Hellenistic Period (335–175 BCE)* (Library of Second Temple Studies 68; London, New York: T&T Clark International, 2008), 260–2, 306–11; cf. also 150–1.

7. See his forthcoming book, *The Architecture of Apocalypticism* (Oxford University Press).

8. On this see the discussion in Grabbe, *A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period 2: The Coming of the Greeks*, 260–2, 306–11; cf. also 150–1. Apocalypses or related writings were already in evidence in the late Persian period, as I show there.

9. See Paul D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1973); Otto Plöger, *Theocracy and Eschatology* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1968); ET of Otto Plöger, *Theokratie und Eschatologie* (WMANT 2; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1959).

no direct connection in either direction—comparison might still suggest how the phenomena operated in Second Temple times. It all depends on the quality of the arguments.

Another condition, though, is that both rabbinic *darash* and Mesopotamian divination relied on learned knowledge, drawing on a body of traditional data built up over many generations. Yet here and there in Second Temple literature we have statements that suggest the knowledge to interpret certain revelations was divinely bestowed—that it was a matter of inspiration, not learned knowledge (e.g. 1QpHab 7:1–5). There is also the fact that many apocalypses have an *angelic* interpreter who gives not only the revelation to the human apocalypticist but also the correct interpretation (e.g. in Daniel and 4 Ezra). This aspect of interpretation seems to be conceived differently from *drš*, as well as from Mesopotamian divination where the interpretation drew on encyclopedic knowledge accumulated over many centuries.

Daniel A. Machiela notes the fact that the apocalypses were originally by and large in Aramaic. What conclusion to draw from this is not so easy, since there are several possibilities. But considering that some early apocalyptic material was in Hebrew (e.g. the "Isaianic Apocalypse" [Isa. 24–27]) and other languages (e.g. some of the Egyptian and Iranian apocalypses), it would seem that many apocalypses were in Aramaic because this was the common vernacular at the time when many apocalypses arose, but Machiela is right that there may be other possibilities. Årstein Justnes raises the intriguing question of the relationship between the "Son of God" text (4Q246ar) and Daniel. It seems to me that he makes a good case for a relationship between the Qumran text and Daniel, but I also think that the response of Joseph Angel is right to ask whether the resemblance might not be because of common apocalyptic motifs, so that the relationship with Daniel is more indirect and not caused by direct borrowing. More important, Angel raises the issue of the *direction* of influence: did 4Q246ar depend on Daniel or could it have been the other way round? It is so easy for us—raised in our scholarly training with a focus on the traditional canon—to give unconscious precedence to the biblical text. If 4Q246ar depends on Daniel, then Justnes is quite right to date it as a post-Danielic composition. But if we do not necessarily accept this dependence, the question of dating is open much wider.

Another general point—already alluded to above—that I raised in 1989 (and was also a feature in Stephen Cook's study some five years later)[10] is this: even though many apocalypses are associated with a crisis or traumatic event, this is not invarably so, nor is association with the poor and marginalized (as Hanson and Plöger assumed). The previous models were unfortunately based on less substantial assumptions than those based on social anthropology. Some of these assumptions sound plausible on the surface but are not supported by actual sociological evidence. Thus, it is often assumed that apocalyptic arises in times of trauma or crisis, when this is not necessarily the case. Neither is it necessarily

10. Cook, *Prophecy and Apocalypticism*.

the product of the oppressed, the marginalized, or the powerless.[11] It seems clear that at least some apocalyptic writings have nothing to do with the various causes often alleged for them, whether millenarian movements, times of crisis, feelings of deprivation, or relative deprivation or powerlessness, nor with any extraordinary sense of alienation. As Kenneth Burridge has noted, "By and large, the participants in Californian apocalyptic, charismatic, and prophetic movements do not reveal those relative deprivations, frustrations, etc. so beloved by so many of the students of the phenomena."[12] Thus, while some apocalypses or apocalyptic-type writings might arise from crisis situations or be the product of the poor and oppressed, such are not the sole cause of an apocalyptic perspective. In sum, the arguments of Plöger and Hanson do not stand up to full examination.[13] I think this point has implications for several of the papers in this volume.

Of course, the poor and marginalized turn to apocalyptic or related thinking if they seem to find no succour elsewhere—sometimes. Of course, the elite and powerful prefer worldly power—sometimes. Of course, apocalyptic thinking is associated with millenarian (apocalyptic) groups—sometimes. Of course, millenarian (apocalyptic) movements produce apocalyptic thinking and apocalypses or related genres of literature—sometimes. But the coupling of one with the other cannot be assumed. When an apocalypse (or related writing) is studied, its social setting should not automatically be reconstructed as a marginalized or powerless group or a millenarian social movement. Indeed, most millenarian leaders catalogued by anthropologists in recent times are educated and middle or upper class, though their followers may be lower down on the social scale. But powerful factions, as the Hasmoneans became, can have a strongly apocalyptic outlook even as they embrace contemporary power. And, don't forget: the Hasmoneans were not always powerful and in charge. They were a minority persecuted group through part of their history, especially in the period from Judas's death to Jonathan's elevation to the high priesthood (c.160–152 BCE). Their worldview may well undergo some sort of transformation, but it does not necessarily abandon apocalyptic thinking or apocalyptic expectations. If a millenarian (apocalyptic) group manages to seize power, they do not suddenly give up their apocalyptic worldview.

This raises the question: Who wrote the apocalyptic writings? It has long seemed to me that the natural choice of author is members of the priesthood.[14]

11. This point was already made in my 1989 article.

12. Burridge, "Reflections on Prophecy and Prophetic Groups," *Semeia*, 2l (1982): l02.

13. In addition to Grabbe, "The Social Setting of Early Jewish Apocalypticism," see the long review of Hanson by Robert P. Carroll, "Twilight of Prophecy or Dawn of Apocalyptic?" *JSOT*, 14 (1979): 3–35.

14. See already my comments in 1989 in "The Social Setting of Early Jewish Apocalypticism." See also Grabbe, *Priests, Prophets, Diviners, Sages: A Socio-historical Study of Religious Specialists in Ancient Israel* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1995), 160–1; Daniel R. Schwartz, *Studies in the Jewish Background of Christianity* (WUNT 60; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), 89–101; Grabbe, "Scribes, Writing, and Epigraphy in

The priests (including the Levites) seem to have been the main body of scribes in the Second Temple period, at least in the early part. Michael Stone already pointed to the priests in his 1980 book.[15] In his contribution to this volume, Daniel Machiela makes the priests the primary composers of apocalypses. He argues that the apocalypses of the "heavenly journey" type serve to legitimate the levitical priesthood. Nor should we think of sectarian priests or groups who had separated themselves from the temple (as Machiela also notes, pointing to the "Jacob-Levi-Amram-Qahat" set of compositions). The temple priests were a diverse lot, and much of the diverse literature of the Hebrew Bible and other Jewish literature was probably written by them. Contra Paul Hanson, there is no reason why priests did not dream apocalyptic dreams.

Was the Maccabaean Revolt an apocalyptic movement?

The general view expressed was that the Maccabaean Revolt was not apocalyptic as such. This was stated in passing by several but was also argued in more detail by several. Boccaccini argued that the closer a writing is to the Hasmoneans, the less apocalyptic it is. Rather than being a reaction to external traumatic events, the apocalyptic worldview is a condition brought about by previous internal dynamics of Jewish society. The marginalized and powerless often take apocalyptic ideas seriously whereas the upper classes exploit apocalyptic expectations for their non-apocalyptic goals. There is a problem with 2 Maccabees, which he disassociates from the Maccabean movement. Although Boccaccini takes it as showing an apocalyptic perspective, at least in some elements (as well as non-Hasmonean), Gruen is sharply critical of this position, since he—and most other commentators—considers the book as pro-Hasmonean. I confess that is also my view. It is not fatal to Boccaccini's position, since this interpretation does not constitute his main argument, but it is a problem, especially one likely to be picked up on by reviewers.

Yonder Gillihan takes a slightly different approach, though also arguing for apocalyptic elements in Hasmonean propaganda. He sees these apocalyptic strains as coming in at the time of John Hyrcanus I and having the purpose of bringing onto the Hasmonean side those who took an apocalyptic view and also to create common ground with those of their apocalyptic-believing critics. This does not mean that they took an apocalyptic view themselves but only sought to subvert the influence of some of the main apocalyptic writings such as Daniel.

the Second Temple Period," in Esther Eshel and Yigal Levin (eds), *"See, I Will Bring a Scroll Recounting What Befell Me" (Ps 40:8): Epigraphy and Daily Life from the Bible to the Talmud, Dedicated to the Memory of Professor Hanan Eshel* (Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplement 12; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014), 105–21.

15. The connection between the priesthood and apocalyptic was already noted by Michael E. Stone, *Scriptures, Sects and Vision: A Profile of Judaism from Ezra to the Jewish Revolts* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1980), 44.

Further, Gerbern Oegema argues that the Maccabean Revolt was in fact an apocalyptic movement. Granted, this is a bit of a hard case to make, as Gruen and also Kampen and DiTommaso robustly respond. Admittedly, apocalyptic-type writings associated with the supporters of the revolt are difficult to find. Oegema points to the *Animal Apocalypse*; Gruen, Kampen and DiTommaso have some doubts, but a convincing argument could be made that the author was a supporter of Judas Maccabeus. Other explanations are of course possible, but seeing Judas as the main figure who leads the "sheep" into the temple is not completely outside the pale. In any case, the service that Oegema has performed, it seems to me, is to point out that the revolt may not have been so divorced from apocalyptic thinking as has been suggested:

> The more apocalypticism is understood as having emerged from a wide variety of social matrices and having been under the inspiration of different kinds of religious leaders, instead of stemming from the socially and economically deprived classes and the marginal and socially alienated figures, as favoured in the crisis theory, the more it becomes obvious that the apocalyptic worldview may have been much more widespread in the third and second centuries BCE and therefore also more central to the Maccabean uprising or even already among the powerful early Second Temple period Zadokite movement than previously thought.

On a related issue, by no means is it likely that most of the apocalypses and related writings that we currently possess arose out of the Maccabean crisis. This point was well made by Machiela. The Aramaic writings that he investigated made it likely that many of the "historical apocalypses" arose already in the early Hellenistic period. (As to the texts he suggests as being in part or whole as historical apocalypses, he would apparently include not only Daniel 7, the *Animal Apocalypse*, and the *Apocalypse of Weeks*, but also Daniel 2, *Four Kingdoms*, Son of God, Genesis Apocryphon 13–15, Apocryphon of Levi, Testament of Jacob, Pseudo Daniel A and B, New Jerusalem, and 4Q558. He also notes that historical elements are found in the Words of Michael, Book of Giants, Enoch's first dream vision [1 Enoch 83–84], Birth of Noah, and Visions of Amram.)

It may well be that the Hasmoneans themselves did not have an apocalyptic worldview, but it seems fair to say that some of their followers and supporters did. This applies not only to those who helped the Maccabees to retake the temple or fought under their leadership but also those who supported the later Hasmonean rulers for the next century. This might apply to the Pharisees who apparently sometimes supported the Hasmoneans and sometimes opposed them (see the section "The Pharisees and apocalyptic" below).

As an analogy, we might keep in mind the fall of Jerusalem in 69–70 CE. When Josephus describes the fiendish resistance of the various groups (who fought among themselves until the Romans came) against the Romans, in what seemed an entirely hopeless situation, he at no point suggests that their motives were anything but patriotism and hatred of the Romans. Yet suddenly he comments

about the last day or two of the siege, that 6,000 people assembled on the portico of the temple, awaiting divine deliverance (*War* 6.4.2 §§283–85). This is a situation not at all hinted at before in Josephus's account, yet it is clear that an apocalyptic worldview motivated at least *some* of the defenders of Jerusalem. It also makes us realize that the fanatical defense by some of the groups may have been based on an apocalyptic expectation of some sort. This should at least give us pause in asserting that no apocalyptic worldview motivated the Hasmoneans or their followers.

Jewish apocalyptic and Iranian influence

Considering how Iranian influence was once such a pervasive part of the argument, with even the proposal that the fundamental origin of Jewish apocalyptic lay with the Persians, it was surprising that only one essay raised a connection between Persian religion and Jewish apocalyptic, that of Vicente Dobroruka. He was specifically focused on showing a connection between Daniel 2.41-43 and the *Zand-ī Vahman Yašt* 1 and 3, but he also made more general points, as I did in my response (though leaving general discussion to this part of the volume). Although his thesis was presented cautiously, it seemed to me that he was fully justified in suggesting that Daniel had borrowed a motif from Iranian tradition. There is general agreement that Persian religion and tradition had its influence on Judaism over the centuries. The question is where this influence was and which of the developments in Judaism can be ascribed to the Iranian side as opposed to the effect of Greek or other cultures or even purely to internal developments.

More broadly, we have to ask a number of questions before postulating Persian influence.[16] Iranologists disagree considerably even on basic points, so that any judgments of one scholar need to be compared with those of other experts. The first question has to do with the dating of the Persian literature. The date of the priest-prophet Zarathushtra or Zoroaster range from about the twelfth/fifteenth century to the sixth century BCE.[17] The next question is what form of religion was promoted by the Persian nobility at the highest level of government. Here there

16. An overview is given in Grabbe, *A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period 1: Yehud: A History of the Persian Province of Judah* (London, New York: T&T Clark International, 2004), 361–4 (Appendix).

17. Mary Boyce, *A History of Zoroastrianism: 1 The Early Period* (vol. 1; HdO I.8.1; Leiden: Brill, 1975); Heidemarie Koch, *Die religiösen Verhältnisse der Dareioszeit: Untersuchungen an Hand der elamischen Persepolistäfelchen* (Göttinger Orientforschungen, III Reihe: Iranica, Band 4; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1977), 171–4; William W. Malandra, *An Introduction to Ancient Iranian Religion: Readings from the Avesta and the Achaemenid Inscriptions* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983), 16–17; Gherardo Gnoli, *Zoroaster in History* (Biennial Yarshater Lectures Series 2; New York: Bibliotheca Persica Press; distributed by Eisenbrauns, Winona Lake, IN, 2000), who gives a lengthy discussion and critique of the various positions.

is no consensus. It has been argued by some eminent scholars that the Persian kings were already Zoroastrian adherents from the beginning. This dating raises another fiercely debated issue: were the Persian kings themselves Zoroastrians? Boyce has no doubts that they were, already from the time of Cyrus, while Koch believes that Darius I followed this belief, but others are more cautious; the general view seems to be that we cannot be sure.[18]

The preserved literature is by and large the product of the post-Islamic period in its present form.[19] It is not always easy to determine what is early and what is late. For example, scholars are agreed that certain of the *Gathas* (the earliest section of the *Avesta*) go back to Zoroaster himself so that his teachings can often be determined. On the other hand, many of the areas of interest for Judaism were not pronounced on by Zoroaster in the extant authentic sayings and can be found only in very late sources such as the *Bundahišn* and the *Denkart*. Boyce has argued that much of this material is early, even though found only in late sources, because it was preserved unchanged in the oral tradition.[20] This may be so, but biblical and Judaic scholars would generally be cautious here since such claims were once made about biblical traditions but are now generally rejected. In addition, if large sections of the *Avesta* could be lost, how certain can we be that what is left has been passed down unchanged? Yet there is agreement among Iranologists that certain beliefs and traditions do represent an early stage of Persian religion and are legitimate for comparison with Second Temple Judaism.

The one set of writings that are generally accepted as ancient are the *Gathas*, which make up the bulk of the liturgical *Yasna*, the older part of the Avesta.[21] The *Gathas* are ascribed to Zoroaster himself, and because they are in poetry in ancient Persian, closely related linguistically to the Sanskrit *Vedas*, this claim has been widely agree on. After that, the subject become more and more controversial. Although the books of what is called the younger *Avesta* are usually seen as ancient as well, the whole was probably not put into writing until beginning about the fourth century or so CE. The argument is that earlier they were handed down by the priests as oral literature. Since the *Gathas* have also been preserved in this way, the claim cannot be rejected out of hand, but it also needs to be supported by evidence rather than just wishful thinking. About 75 percent of the books of

18. Boyce, "The Religion of Cyrus the Great," in Amélie Kuhrt and Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg (eds), *Achaemenid History III: Method and Theory* (Proceeding of the London 1985 Achaemenid History Workshop; Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 1988), 15–31; Koch, *Die religiösen Verhältnisse der Dareioszeit*, 176. On the general view, see *HPE*: 93–4.

19. H. H. Bailey, *Zoroastrian Problems in the Ninth-Century Books: Ratanbai Katrak Lectures* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1943).

20. E.g. Boyce, *Zoroastrianism: A Shadowy but Powerful Presence in the Judaeo-Christian World* (Friends of Dr. Williams's Library Lecture; London: Dr Williams's Trust, 1987), 10.

21. For an edition and English translation of the *Gathas*, see S. Insler, *The* Gāthās *of Zarathustra* (Acta Iranica 8: Troisième Série, Textes et Mémoires 1; Leiden: Brill, 1975).

the *Avesta* have been lost, though in some cases the content is known through the commentaries (the *Zend*) written in Middle Persian.

The Iranian eschatological tradition is no less interesting but harder to deal with because of uncertainties about dating and about the state of the text. This area has occasioned a good deal of debate because of doubts about the antiquity of some of the main Zoroastrian eschatological and apocalyptic texts.[22] Support for the early dating of such ideas has been found in the *Oracle of Hystaspes*. We know it only as quoted in several of the patristic writers (Justin, *Apol.* 1.44.12; Clement of Alexandria, *Strom*. 6.43.1; Lactantius, *Div. Inst*. 7.15.19, 7.18.2); however, it is often thought to be a Hellenistic Iranian oracle.[23]

The result is that a number of Iranian scholars are prepared to argue that the eschatalogical/apocalyptic ideas are found at an early time in Zoroastrianism. Boyce for one is prepared to argue that it goes back to Zoroaster himself.[24] While Hinnells agrees that they are early, he looks to the turn of the era for most influence. If so, most of the eschatological influence (even though it could still be called "early," i.e. much earlier than the extant texts) is still post-Achaemenid. There is also the question of weighing possible Iranian influence against that from the Hellenic side. Of particular interest in all this—to bring us back to the proposal of Dobroruka— is the *Zand-ī Vahman Yašt*, often referred to in the secondary literature as the *Bahman Yašt*. All agree that it is a late compilation,

22. Mary Boyce, "On the Antiquity of Zoroastrian Apocalyptic," *BSOAS*, 47 (1984), 57–75; Anders Hultgård, "Das Judentum in der hellenistisch-römischen Zeit und die iranische Religion—ein religionsgeschichtliches Problem," *ANRW II* (1979), 19.2.512–90; "*Bahman Yasht*: A Persian Apocalypse," in John J. Collins and James H. Charlesworth (eds), *Mysteries and Revelations: Apocalyptic Studies since the Uppsala Colloquium* (JSPSup 9; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 114–34; "Persian Apocalypticism," in John J. Collins (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism: Volume 1. The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity* (New York: Continuum, 1999), 39–83; John Hinnells, "Zoroastrian Influence on Biblical Imagery: Introduction," in idem., *Zoroastrian and Parsi Studies: Selected Works of John R. Hinnells* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000), 29–43.

23. Hultgård, "Persian Apocalypticism" (1999), 74–8; however, David Flusser argues that it is Jewish; see "Hystaspes and John of Patmos," in S. Shaked (ed.), *Irano-Judaica: Studies Relating to Jewish Contacts with Persian Culture Throughout the Ages* (Jerusalem: Ben Zvi Institute, 1982), 12–75 (= D. Flusser, *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity* [Jerusalem: Magnes, 1988], 390–453).

24. Boyce, "On the Antiquity of Zoroastrian Apocalyptic," *BSOAS*, 47 (1984), 57–75; Anders Hultgård, "Das Judentum in der hellenistisch-römischen Zeit und die iranische Religion—ein religionsgeschichtliches Problem," *ANRW II* (1979), 19.2.512–90; "*Bahman Yasht*: A Persian Apocalypse," in John J. Collins and James H. Charlesworth (eds), *Mysteries and Revelations: Apocalyptic Studies Since the Uppsala Colloquium* (JSPSup 9; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 114–34; "Persian Apocalypticism," (1999), 39–83; Hinnells, "The Zoroastrian Doctrine of Salvation in the Roman World," in E. J. Sharpe and John R. Hinnells (eds), *Man and His Salvation: Studies in Memory of S. G. F. Brandon* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1973), 125–48.

but some argue that it stems from earlier sources.[25] This makes Dobroruka's suggestion that the metaphor of iron mixed with clay in Daniel 2.33–34, 41–43 stems from Iranian tradition much more plausible, even if the state of the debate is still far from conclusive.

The Pharisees and apocalyptic

The Pharisees have often been portrayed in modern secondary literature as a peaceful group of rabbis without apocalyptic concerns. But Kenneth Atkinson, drawing on the example of Alexander Janneus, argues that the Pharisees opposed Janneus because of their expectations of the time of the end (based on their interpretation of the Seventy Weeks Prophecy of Daniel 9–10). I long ago pointed out that Josephus does not say that Janneus's opponents were Pharisees, though I allow that Pharisees were among those opponents.[26] But did the Pharisees hold an apocalyptic worldview? We do not see much indication of this for those who might have been Pharisees among the early sages of rabbinic literature.[27] Their concern is with daily living by certain rules rather than a focus on a catastrophic future. This was the strength of the movement: seeing the cosmic and the eternal in the minutiae of purity, eating, and living from day to day.

Yet other passages of ancient literature on the Pharisees indicate an apocalyptic interest—at least, on the part of some—in the period before 70 or even between 70 and 135 ce. The NT indicates an interest in the messiah and eschatology among the Pharisees (e.g. Mk 12:35-37; Matt. 22:41-46; Lk. 17:20-21). Also, according to rabbinic tradition, one of the most famous of the early sages (and often identified as a Pharisee in modern discussion) Rabbi Aqiva was implicated in the Bar Kokhva Revolt because of his views about the coming of the messiah (e.g. *y. Ta'an.* 4:8 68a; *b. Sanh*. 97b; *Lament. Raba* 2:2). The references seem to be late, however, and one could question whether Aqiva actually held such a view. Josephus makes no mention of messianic or apocalyptic beliefs among the Pharisees. Of course, Atkinson's reconstruction is somewhat speculative (as his respondents pointed

25. Hultgård, "*Bahman Yasht*: A Persian Apocalypse," in John J. Collins and James H. Charlesworth (eds), *Mysteries and Revelations: Apocalyptic Studies since the Uppsala Colloquium* (JSPSup 9; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 114–34; "Persian Apocalypticism," 43.

26. Grabbe, *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian: Vol. I: Persian and Greek Periods; Vol. II: Roman Period* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), I: 304. What is probably a reference to this event in 4QpNahum 1.6–7 is often assumed to be a reference to Pharisees, but this is a scholarly reconstruction: no ancient text states that Seekers after Smooth Things were Pharisees. The term may have indicated a variety of groups in Qumran history.

27. Cf. especially Jacob Neusner, *The Rabbinic Traditons about the Pharisees before 70* (3 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1971). See the discussion in Grabbe, *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian*, II: 477–82; ibid., *Judaic Religion in the Second Temple Period: Belief and Practice from the Exile to Yavneh* (London, New York: Routledge, 2000), 194–6.

out) and has hardly been proved. On the other hand, Albert Baumgarten accepts that he has made a good case for something that cannot be proved on present data, and I agree. It is a big subject that deserves extensive treatment, but that at least some Pharisees held an apocalyptic worldview seems to me to be a conclusion that cannot be gainsaid.

Apocalyptic and chronological calculations

One feature of apocalypses and related writings is the frequent presence of chronological data, sometimes of the age of the earth in the past and also calculations of when future events would take place. Sometimes the dating is only relative, such as the succession of past empires (as discussed, e.g. by Dobroruka). But calculations are often more precise. Kenneth Atkinson draws our attention to an important element of the apocalyptic worldview, the idea that the future takes place according to a divine plan with indications of the chronology revealed in various ways. Daniel has a number of chronological calculations, including the Seventy Weeks Prophecy of Chapters 9–10. Atkinson cites my own study of Daniel 9–10,[28] but commentaries on Daniel and other studies have often addressed to some extent the apocalyptic "timetable"—or, more accurately, "timetables"—found in the book, which is not limited to the Seventy Weeks Prophecy.[29]

Yonder Gillihan argues that there are at least four interpretations of the Seventy Weeks Prophecy, one in 1 Maccabees and three in Josephus. Although it is evidenced only in subtle hints, he believes that even the Hasmoneans appropriated aspects of Daniel 9 into their descriptions of their dynastic succession (e.g. the "week" of Daniel 9.27 relates to the seven-year vacancy in the high priesthood between the accession of Alcimus and the accession of Jonathan Maccabee), especially in 1 Maccabee 7.1-9 and 9.27-73. The audience familiar with Daniel 9 would see the coincidences; on the other hand, the Hasmonean establishment could ignore or even deny any connection if it suited their purpose. Gillihan sees two pro-Hasmonean and two anti-Hasmonean positions in Josephus. *Ant*. 12.10.6–11.2 §§414–34; 13.2.3 §46 takes the position that Judas actually succeeded Alcimus as high priest, in which case Jonathan only continued the Hasmonean high priestly line. Similarly, *Ant*. 20. §§233–38 could be interpreted as suggesting that the final seven years of evil began with Alcimus's tenure as high priest, but he died halfway through the period. An anti-Hasmonean interpretation is suggested by *War* 1.3.1 §70; *Ant*. 13.11.1 §§301, in which an evil ruler is in office in year

28. Grabbe, "The 70-Weeks Prophecy (Daniel 9:24-27) in Early Jewish Interpretation," in Craig A. Evans and Shemaryahu Talmon (eds), *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders* (Biblical Interpretation Series 28; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 595–611.

29. John J. Collins, *A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993).

483, who is the Maccabean ruler Alexander Janneus. A final anti-Hasmonean perspective is that no calculations of chronology are possible, and the Maccabean high priesthood is illegitimate.

Atkinson, in his response, proposes that 4Q390 provides further support for Gillihan's interpretation of pro- and anti-Hasmonean claims. Following Hanan Eshel, he accepts that this text believes the final redemption will follow the period of 490 years. He thinks that Josephus (*War* 1.3.1 §70; *Ant*. 13.11.1 §§301) may have been relying on a similar tradition to 4Q390. If 4Q390 is one of several copies of *Apocryphon of Jeremiah*, then 4Q387 3 4-67 (another copy) may contain a denunciation of Alexander Janneus's priesthood. Atkinson also argues that the Pharisees may have opposed Janneus because of the Seventy Weeks Prophecy. This is based on his revised chronology of the invasion of Palestine by Demetrius III, based on coinage. In her response to his proposal, Gambetti was skeptical of his redating based on coinage. Regardless of this criticism, however, one must admit that the dates coincide very closely in any case.

The strength of the apocalyptic worldview: Persistence through infinite flexibility

The apocalyptic worldview is doomed to disappointment—at least, it has been so far. The apocalypticists are forever confident that their schemes are just around the corner from fulfillment, yet time and again their predictions fail. The world did not end in 165 bce or in the time of Napoleon or in 1844 or in 2012. The failure of a prophecy will usually disillusion some of the prophet's followers, but often not all and especially not the protagonist himself or herself (unless they commit suicide, which is not unknown!). One of the frequent responses to the lack of prophetic fulfillment is to recalculate and reinterpret.

A good example of this involves the Seventy Weeks Prophecy, already discussed in the previous section. We find a history of two millennia in which this was repeatedly reinterpreted to fit the current situation.[30] One can look with amazement and admiration at the way in which the original pattern was, time and again, fitted to current history and found to match exactly—with a little ingenuity.

We all look for a better future. It is just that those with an apocalyptic worldview expect it to come about through supernatural means; indeed, they have an idea of when and how that will happen, because it has been revealed through visions, dreams, or the secrets conveyed by esoteric writings. One approach—quite common among contemporary evangelicals—is to make the eschaton very indefinite. That is, you acknowledge that it could happen at any moment, paying lip service to the concept, but live as if it is quite a way in the future. It is a very

30. Some of examples of the various interpretations through history are catalogued in L. E. Knowles, "The Interpretation of the Seventy Weeks of Daniel in the Early Fathers," *WTJ* 7 (1944–5): 136–60.

difficult mind set to refute. The apocalyptist has two advantages: the infinite flexibility to interpret both texts and events, and the fact that a new naive generation of followers will be coming along. Whatever our views on it, the apocalyptic worldview will continue to be with us for a long time.

INDEX

1 Enoch 35–6, 75, 98, 100, 111, 137, 147–8, 151, 154, 155, 244 *see also Animal Apocalypse*; Similitudes, the
  Apocalypse of Weeks 31, 89 n.7, 98, 111, 115, 117, 148, 150, 151, 154, 194, 244
  Book of Giants 147, 150, 151, 152, 154, 155, 194, 244
  Book of Tobit and 114–15
  Book of Watchers 20–1, 31, 90, 147, 150–1, 152
  dating of 150
  Dead Sea Scrolls and 74–5
  Maccabean Revolt and 79–81, 139–40
1. Henochbuch 155 *see also* 1 Enoch
1 Maccabees 5, 6, 22, 33–4, 39–40, 41, 128, 136, 139
  as Hasmonean propaganda 214, 215 n.7, 216, 217, 221–3
  Hasmonean succession and 217–18, 226, 249
  as historiography 91
  Maccabean Revolt and 77–9, 97, 100
  messianism and 175
  resistance groups and 221
1QM 190
1QSb 170
11QapostrZion 176
2 Baruch 111
2 Enoch 170
2 Maccabees 5, 8, 22–3, 38–40, 137, 139
  Maccbean Revolt and 77–9, 97–8, 100, 243
3 Baruch 111
4 Ezra, Book of 111
4Q175 (4QTestimonia) 175, 220, 227
4Q246 (4QApocryphon of Daniel ar) 6–7, 148, 150, 151, 154, 155, 176, 183–91, 193–5, 233, 241
4Q339 150
4Q378/379 (4QapocrJoshua) 175
4Q385a (*Apocryphon of Jeremiah*) 53–4
4Q387 (*Apocryphon of Jeremiah*) 53, 250
4Q390 (*Apocryphon of Jeremiah C*^{e}) 52–3, 59, 142–3, 226, 250
4Q448 175–6
4Q521 5–6, 169–76, 179–80
4Q556 148, 155, 244
4Q556a 148, 155, 244
4Q557 148, 155, 244
4Q558 148, 154, 155, 244
4QApocryphon of Daniel ar (4Q246) *see* 4Q246
4QApocryphon of Jeremiah C^{e} (4Q390) *see* 4Q390
4QBirth of Noah 90 see also *Birth of Noah, The*; *Birth of Noah* (4Q534–36)
4QInstruction 90
4QpapApocalypse (4Q489) 148, 155
4QTestimonia (4Q175) 175, 220, 227
4QVision a-c (4Q556–558) 148, 154, 155, 244
6QApocalypse (6Q14) 148, 155

Abraham 15–16
Abraham, Testament of 135
afterlife 12–13
"ages of the world" mythical complex 160, 163, 166, 167, 168
Ahriman 164
Alcimus 26–7, 217–19, 249
Alessandra Nangeroni International Endowment 3
Alexander, P. 125
Alexander Janneus 29–30, 45–6, 58–9, 62–3, 127–8, 141–3, 175–6, 220
  coinage 55
  enemies of 48–55
  eschatology and 60–1
  Pharisees and 49, 51, 55, 58–60, 62, 66, 248, 250
  predictions and 219, 250
Alexander the Great 33
Alexandra Salome 29–30, 35, 137
Ananias 63
Angel, Joseph 233, 241
angelic figures 172
Animal Apocalypse 30, 89 n.7, 98–9, 139, 148, 150, 154
  as historiography 91
  Maccabean Revolt and 244
Antigonus 61, 175, 220
Antioch 47
Antiochus II 160
Antiochus III 140, 160

Antiochus IV Epiphanes 21, 23, 24–6, 37, 92, 97, 111, 129, 133, 140, 160, 189–90, 194
Antiochus V 26
Antiochus VII Sidetes 228
Antiochus X Eusebes 47, 48, 58
Antiochus XI Epiphanes 47, 48
Antiochus XII 47, 49
Antiquities of the Jews (Josephus) 46, 48–9, 52
apocalypse 31, 105 *see also* apocalyptic
  definition of 11–13, 131–2
Apocalypse of Weeks 31, 89 n.7, 98, 111, 115, 117, 148, 150, 151, 154, 194, 244
apocalypses 103, *see also* apocalyptic texts
  "Isaiah apocalypse" 238
  as literary genre 138
  chronological calculations and 249–50
  Zechariah apocalypse 238
apocalyptic 6, 14–18, 31
  approaches to 8
  definition of 14, 131–2, 237–8
  crises and 18–30, 77, 107–8, 110, 127, 128, 131, 134–6, 239–42
  scribal nature of 17–18
  social context 18–19
apocalyptic dualisms 214–15
apocalyptic eschatology 17, 104
apocalyptic events 33–41, 135–6
apocalyptic literature 76, 89, 90–3, 95–100, 111, 128–9, 238 *see also* apocalyptic texts
  authors of 204–7, 210–11, 242–3
  Book of Daniel 89
  early Jewish novels 114–16
  ethics and 100
  phenomenology and 125–7
  Qumran scrolls 111–14
  Roman conquest and 211
  terminology 90, 132
apocalyptic minimum 94
apocalyptic movements 110
apocalyptic texts 33–41, 73, 103, 121–2, 134–8, 142, 148, 152, 154 *see also* apocalyptic literature
  historical events and 139, 140, 141
  Vision of Gabriel 128
apocalyptic worldviews 5, 8–9, 103–5, 109–12, 121–4, 128, 134–5
  causes and social setting of 239–43
  definition 133–4, 231, 237–8, 239
  development of 89, 94
  early Jewish novels and 114–16
  persistence of 250–1
  Qumran scrolls and 111–14
  spread of 116–20
apocaplyticism 69–70, 94, 104–5
  approaches to 88–90
  civic ideology and 214, 222–3, 228–8
  as historical movement 138
  history of literature approach 70–2
  intellectual history approach 74–5
  Maccabean Revolt and 75–84, 88–94
  mediaeval apocalypticism 94
  phenomenology of 125–7
  reception-historical approach 73–4
  religion and tradition-historical approach 72
  social setting approach 73
  sociological causes of 127–9
  theological approach 72–3
Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and in the Near East (Hellholm) 73–4
Apocrypha, the 201
Apocryphon of Daniel (4Q246) *see* 4Q246
Apocryphon of Jeremiah (4Q385a) 53–4
Apocryphon of Jeremiah (4Q387) 53, 250
Apocryphon of Jeremiah C^{e} (4Q390) *see* 4Q390
Apocryphon of Joshua 175
Apocryphon of Levi (4Q540–41) 148, 154, 244
Apollonius the Mysiarch 25
Apostel, Leo 106
Aqiva (Rabbi) 248
Aramaic language 148–50, 153, 157–8, 233–4, 241
Aramaic Levi Document (1QLevi, 4Q213a, 4Q213b) 90, 148, 150, 151, 155
Aramaic literature 7, 147–54, 157–8, 233
Aramaica Qumranica conference 147
Aristobulus I 29, 52–3, 61, 175, 220
Aristobulus II 30, 128
Assumption of Moses, Maccadean Revolt and 83–4, 99–100, 141
astrology 15–16
Astronomical Book 90, 147, 150
Atkinson, Kenneth 58–64, 66–7, 141–3, 240, 248, 249, 250
authority 213–14
Avesta 246–7
Avestan language 163
Azizus, the Phylarch of the Arabs 47

b. Qiddusin 61–2
b. Sukkah 58–9
Bagoas 63–4
Bahman Yašt (*Zand-ī Vahman Yašt*) 5 see also *Zand-ī Vahman Yašt (Bahman Yašt*)
Baumgarten, Albert 249
Ben Sira, Book of 129
  Maccabean Revolt and 82

Berenice 160
Berger, Peter 107
Bernstein, Moshe 210
Bettencourt, Luís 117–18, 119
Beyer, Klaus 191
Beyerle, Stefan 115
Biblical Theology Movement 17
Birth of Noah (4Q534–36) 148
Birth of Noah, The 148, 150, 151, 154, 155, 244
  see also 4QBirth of Noah; *Birth of Noah* (4Q534–36)
Birth of Noah (4Q534–36) 148
Boccaccini, Gabriele 135–8, 240, 243
  Early Enoch Literature, The 74–5
Book of Ben Sira 129 *see also* Book of Sirach
  Maccabean Revolt and 82
Book of Daniel 33, 37–8, 39–40, 137, 142, 148, 152, 154, 155 *see also* Nebuchadnezzar of Assiria
  4Q521 and 169–76, 179–80
  4QApocryphon of Daniel ar (4Q246) and 183–91, 193–5, 233, 241
  as apocalypse and 31, 89, 90, 91–4, 111, 114, 135, 157, 216–17, 244
  chronology 216–19, 225–6, 249
  dating of 150
  empires and 159 n. 1
  as Hasmonean propaganda 215 n. 7, 215–19, 222–3, 249
  heroes of Daniel, veneration of 215–16, 224–5
  language and 150
  historical context of 15
  Maccabean Revolt and 82–3, 99, 140–1
  messianism and 169–76, 179–81
  righteous human figures and 150–1
  Zand-ī Wahman Yasn (ZWY) and 159–68, 232–3, 245
Book of Deuteronomy 180–1
Book of Dream Visions 33, 35–7, 40, 111, 117, 137, 147–8, 151
Book of Enoch *see* 1 Enoch
Book of Giants 147, 150, 151, 152, 154, 155, 194, 244
Book of Isaiah 82
Book of Judith 34–5, 39–40, 41, 136–7
Book of Sirach 34
  Maccabean Revolt and 82, 90
Book of Tobit 114–16, 135
Book of Watchers 20–1, 31, 90, 147, 151, 152
  dating of 150
"Books of the Maccabees and Sectarianism in Second Temple Judaism, The" (Kampen) 97
Boyce, Mary 246–7
Brenner, J. 128

Carmignac, J. 154 n. 4
Castillo-Cháves, Carlos 117
CD 209, 210
Chalcraft, David 113
chronologies 249–50
Cintrón-Arias, Ariel 117
circumcision 22–3
civic authority 213–14
civic ideology 213–14, 222–3, 228–9
Cleopatra III 63
coinage 47–8, 55, 66
Collins, John J. 71 n.9, 73, 105, 111, 125, 150–1, 155
  Early Enoch Literature, The 74–5
  Son of Man and 171
communication 116–20
Community Rule, the 112, 113
Conflicted Boundaries on Wisdom and Apocalypticism (Wright and Wills) 96
connectors 117
Cook, Stephen L. 110
  Prophecy and Apocalypticism: The Postexilic Setting 73
Covenanters, the 220
crisis situations 18–30, 77, 107–8, 110, 127, 128, 131, 134–6, 239–42
Cross, Frank M. 191
cultural conditions 116

Dąbrowa, Edward 51
Damascus 47–8
Damascus Document 113
Daniel 216
Daniel, Apocryphon of (4Q246) *see* 4Q246
Daniel, Book of *see* Book of Daniel
Daniel-Suzanna 154
darash 198–9, 240–1
darshan 200, 208, 210
Davidic dynasty 172–4, 176, 179, 180
Dawn of Apocalyptic (Hanson) 104, 157
Dead Sea Scrolls 75 *see also* Qumran scrolls
Demetrius II 27
Demetrius III 4–5, 29, 47
  coinage 47–8, 55, 66
  invasion of Judea 45–55, 58, 59–60, 66, 141–3
  war with Philip I 48, 58
Demonstration Evangelica (Eusebius of Caesarea) 53, 55
Derrida, Jacques 75 n.17
Deuteronomy, Book of 180–1

Diadochi, the 40
Dimant, Devorah 53–4, 149, 155
disease, spread of 116–20, 123
DiTommaso, Lorenzo 155, 239, 240, 244
divination 15
divine judgement 151
divine messages 200
  decoding 7–8, 202–7, 208, 209–10, 240–1
divine revelation 214
Dobroruka, Vincente 168, 232–3, 245, 247–8
doresh haTorah 201, 205, 208
Dream Visions, Book of 33, 35–7, 40, 137, 147–8, 151
dreams 14–15
Dreams, Book of 111, 117

Early Enoch Literature, The (Boccaccini and Collins) 74–5
Egypt 24, 139–40
Elgvin, Torleif 179–81
empires 159 n.1, 165 *see also* Davidic dynasty; "world empires" mythical complexes
Enoch 170, 172
Enoch conferences 3
Enochic apocalyptic tradition 35–6
epidemics 123 *see also* disease; epidemiological models
epidemiological models 117, 120, 123, 125
eschatology 12–13
  Alexander Janneus and 60–1
  apocalyptic eschatology 17, 104
  Assumption of Moses and 83–4
  Book of Ben Sira and 82
  Book of Daniel and 82–3
  Book of Enoch and 81, 139
  Book of Tobit and 115
  Iran and 247
  Maccabean Revolt and 75–84
  Pharisees and 59–60, 62, 63
  Sibylline Oracles and 81–2, 99, 140
Eshel, Hanan 51–2, 142–3, 220, 226
Essenes: *Nahum Pesher*, and the 51
Eusebius of Caesarea: *Demonstration Evangelica* 53, 55
evil 37, 76, 93
Exagoge of Ezekiel the Tragedian 170
exegetai 201
exegetes 126

Fletcher-Lewis, C. 126
flood, the 151
Flusser, David 185 n. 9
Foucault, Michel 75 n.17
Four Kingdoms (4Q552–53) 148, 150, 154, 155, 244
Frey, Jörg 155

Gabriel Inscription 172 n.9
Galilee 127–8
Gambetti, Sandra 250
García Martinez, Florentino 155, 166, 190 n.26
Gathus 246
Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20) 148, 150, 151–2, 154, 155, 244
Geron the Athenian 25
Giants, Book of 147, 150, 151, 152, 154, 155, 194, 244
Gigantenbuch 155
Gillihan, Yonder Moynihan 224–9, 243, 249–50
Gladwell, Malcolm 117
global norm diffusion 120 n. 77
"Go Out and Study the Land" (Judges 18:2). Archaeological, Historical and Textual Studies in Honor of Hanan Eshel (Meir, Magness, and Schiffman) 123
Golan 127–8
Gospel of Matthew 170 n.5
Grabbe, Lester L. 53, 95, 131–3, 168, 226, 231, 239
grammateus 202
Greek culture 20, 22, 24, 31
Gruen, Erich 97, 238, 239, 243, 244
Gunkel, Hermann 72
gymnasia 22–4

haggadah/haggadot (lore) 199, 200, 208
hakham 200, 210
halakhah (law) 199, 200, 208
halakhic allowance, the 221–2
Halperin, D. J. 125
Hanson, Paul D. 16, 71, 95, 242
  Dawn of Apocalyptic 104, 157
Hasideans, the 96
Hasmonean civil ideology 213–14, 222–3, 228–9
Hasmonean history 19–30, 132, 242
Hasmonean propaganda 6, 213–23, 224–9, 243, 249
Hasmonean state 28–31, 39–40, 127, 133, 173–6
Hasmonean succession 217–19, 225–6, 249–50
He That Cometh 220
heavenly figures 170, 171, 172, 179, 180
heavenly mediators 151–2, 238
Hebrew language 127, 149–50, 153, 233–4, 241
Hellenistic history 140–1

Hellenization 20–2, 31, 132–3, 153
Hellholm, David: *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and in the Near East* 73–4
Hermes 22
Herod 63
Herodotus 160, 161
heroes of Daniel, veneration of 215–16, 224–5
Hesiod 161
  Works and Days 160
high priesthood 27, 151–3, 157 *see also* Hasmonean succession
  as authors 242–3
  dispute over 21–4, 31
  messianism and 173–6
Himmelfarb, Martha 95
Hinnells, John 247
historiographies 91
history 16–18, 91
  Book of Daniel and 82
Hodayot, the 170
Homer: *Iliad* 138
Hosea, Book of 51–2
Hosea Pesher^{b} (4Q167) 51–2
human agency 117–18
humanities, the 121
Hyrcanus I 28, 60–1, 127–8, 175, 219–20, 224–5, 227–8
Hyrcanus II 30

ideas, spread of 116–20, 123, 128, 135
ideology 213–14, 222–3, 228–9
Idumea 28, 128
Iliad (Homer) 138
intermarriage 159, 161
interpretation 7–8
Iran 232, 234, 245–8 *see also* Persia
Isaac (Rabbi) 197–8
Isaiah, Book of 82
"Isiah apocalypse" 238
Israel 33–5
  God's punishment and 37

Jacob 170, 197–8
Jacob, Testament of (4Q537) 148, 150, 152, 154, 155, 244
Jannaeus, Alexander *see* Alexander Jannaeus
Jason (High Priest, brother of Onias III) 21–3, 24–5, 132–3
Jaspers, Karl 107, 110
Jeremiah, Apocryphon of (4Q385a) 53–4
Jeremiah, Apocryphon of (4Q387) 53
Jeremiah C^{e}*, Apocryphon of* (4Q390) 52–3, 142–3, 226, 250
Jericho 175
Jerusalem 21–5, 30, 127, 128–9, 175, 244–5
Jesus Sirach 34, 92
  Maccabean Revolt and 82, 90
Jewish literature 127
Jewish nation, the 84
Jewish novels 114–16
Jewish prosperity 35, 139–40
Jewish society 5, 33, 40–1, 119, 127, 157, 239–43, 244 *see also* society
Jewish War, The (Josephus) 46, 48–9, 52
Jews in the Persian Court 152, 155
John Hyrcanus I 28, 60–1, 127–8, 175, 219–20, 224–5, 227–8
John of Patmos 126
Jonathan Apphus 26–7, 51, 133 *see also* Maccabee, Jonathan
Joseph, Testament of 155
Joseph and Aseneth 135
Josephus 45–51, 52–3, 55, 59, 62–4, 66, 141–2
  Antiquities of the Jews 46, 48–9, 52, 63, 141
  Hasmonean succession and 217–18, 226, 249–50
  Jerusalem and 244–5
  Jewish War, The 46, 48–9, 52, 141
  John Hyrcanus I and 225, 227–8
Joshua, Apocryphon of 175
Jubilees 152, 153, 170, 176
Judah 20, 27–8, 31, 51, 133
Judah, Testament of 155
Judah Maccabee 97–100, 133, 139, 141, 173–4 *see also* Judas Maccabee
Judaism
  attempted suppression of 24–6, 31
  sects 28–9, 55 *see also* Pharisees, the
Judas Maccabee 25–6, 38, 39, 80–1, 83, 97–9, 217–19, 244, 249 *see also* Judah Maccabee
Judea 30, 51–2, 103–4, 120, 123, 130, 173, 174–5
  apocalypticism and 127–9
  Demetrius III and 45–55, 59–60, 66
  civil ideology in 213
Judith 35, 137
Judith, Book of 34–5, 39–40, 41, 136–7
Justnes, Årstein 176, 193–5, 233, 241

Kaiser, David 117
Kampen, John 244
  "Books of the Maccabees and Sectarianism in Second Temple Judaism, The" 97
Kearney, Michael 106
Koch, Klaus 71, 138, 246

kohen |(priest) 203 n.21 *see also* high priesthood
Kraft, Charles 106–7

Ladder of Jacob 170
language
  4QApocryphon of Daniel ar (4Q246) and 187–9, 194
  Aramaic 148–50, 153, 157–8, 233–4, 241
  Avestan 163
  darash 198–9
  Hebrew 127, 149, 153, 157, 233–4, 241
  Jewish society and 157
  midrash 197–207, 208–11
  symbolic and mythological 79–80, 84–5
language of description 121
law 199, 200, 201–3, 206, 208, 209, 210
lead 130
Levi, Apocryphon of (4Q540–41) 148, 154, 244
Levine, Lee 97
"Lists of Revealed Things" (Stone) 95
literature
  apocalyptic literature *see* apocalyptic literature
  Persian 5, 157–8, 159, 232, 245–7
  pesher literature 201, 203
  prophetic literature 76, 92–3, 94
  Second Temple literature 201
  wisdom literature 95
Lysias 26
Lysimachus 23

m. Sukkah 58
Maccabean independence 26–8, 31
Maccabean Revolt 24–6, 31, 33, 69, 84–5, 132–3
  apocalypticism and 75–84, 138–41, 157, 243–5
  Assumption of Moses and 83–4, 99–100, 141
  writings reflecting on 77–84, 90–100
Maccabee, Jonathan 217–19, 249 *see also* Jonathan Apphus
Maccabee, Judah *see* Judah Maccabee
Maccabee, Judas *see* Judas Maccabee
Maccabee, Simon *see* Simon Maccabee
McGinn, B. 125
Machiela, Daniel 157–8, 233–4, 238, 241, 243, 244
Magness, J.: *"Go Out and Study the Land" (Judges 18:2). Archaeological, Historical and Textual Studies in Honor of Hanan Eshel* 123
Mandel, Paul 208–11, 240
mantic wisdom 14–15, 204
maskilim, the 99
Mattathias 34, 78, 100, 221–2
Matthew, Gospel of 170 n. 5
mavens 117
mediaeval apocalypticism 94
mediation 203–4
meḥoqeq (law deciders) 202
Meir, A. M.: *"Go Out and Study the Land" (Judges 18:2). Archaeological, Historical and Textual Studies in Honor of Hanan Eshel* 123
Melchizedeq 170–1
Menelaus (High Priest) 23, 24, 25–6, 132–3
Meshorer, Ya'akov 55
Mesopotamian culture 202–7, 241
messianism 5–6, 169–76, 179–81, 219 n.18
"metals in decaying sequence" mythical complex 160–1, 164, 168, 232
midrash 197–207, 208
Milik, Josef T. 175
millenarian movements 19
millennialism 60–4, 110
mimesis 126
Mishnah, the 49, 61
mishnayot 199
Mithridates Sinakes 47
moreh hazedek 201
Moses 170
Moses, Testament of 111
mysticism 125–7
myth 16–17
mythical complexes 160–8, 232

Nahman, Rav 197
Nahum Pesher, the 50–2
Nangeroni, Alessandro 3–4
Nangeroni, Gabriella 3
Nangeroni Enoch conferences 3, 94
Nangeroni family 3
Nebuchadnezzar of Assiria 34
  dream of 92, 160, 164
network theory 135
Neue Jerusalem 155
New Jerusalem (1Q32, 2Q24, 4Q554, 554a, 555, 5Q15, 11Q18) 148, 151, 152, 154, 155, 244
Nickelsburg, George 100
  "Tobit and Enoch: Distant Cousins with a Recognizable Resemblance" 114–15
Noah 151 see also *Birth of Noah*
Nomikos (law instructor) 202
nomos 107
Noth, Martin 172, 176
novels 114–16
nudity 22

Oegema, Gerbern S. 88–100, 138–41, 239, 244
Ohrmazd 164
Onias III 21, 23
Onias IV 23
Open Heaven, The (Rowland) 126
Oracle of Hystaspes 247
oral teaching 17–18
Orlov, Andrei 170
outsiders 112

paganism 22
Pahlavi texts 163, 232
parchment 130
patah 199, 208
Persepolis and Jerusalem: Iranian influence on the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic (Silverman) 234
Persia *see also* Iran
  literature 5, 157–8, 159, 232, 245–7
  religion 245–6
  Zand-ī Wahman Yasn (ZWY) 159–68, 232–3
pesharim 208, 210
pesher 203, 209, 210
pesher literature 201, 203
Pesher Nahum 209–10
petiḥah 199–200, 201, 208
Pharisees, the 4–5, 28–30, 55, 66–7, 142, 143, 201–2
  4Q521 and 171
  Alexander Janneus and 49, 51, 55, 58–60, 62, 66, 248, 250
  apocalyptic and 244, 248–9
  eschatology 59–60, 62, 63
  Herod and 63–4
  interpretation and 209
  Nahum Pesher, and the 51
  Yannai and 61–2
Pheroras 63
Pheroras, wife of 64
Philip (viceroy of Jerusalem) 25, 26
Philip I Philadelphus 46, 47, 48, 58
Phineas 34
Piaget, Jean 108
piety 152–3
Piovanelli, Pierluigi 231
pišru (solution) 203
Plöger, Otto 242
  Theokratie und Eschataologie 157
Pompey (Roman legate) 30
Portier-Young, Anathea E. 121–4, 125, 126, 127, 129, 133–5, 151, 237, 240
  Apocalypse Against Empire: Theologies of Resistance in Early Judaism 124
posher 203, 205
Prayer for King Jonathan 175–6
Prayer of Nabonidus 152, 155
priesthood *see* high priesthood
prophecy 14–18, 129, 132 *see also* mysticism
  apocalypticism and 70–2, 75, 89–90, 239
  persistence of 250–1
Prophecy and Apocalypticism: The Postexilic Setting (Cook) 73
prophetic literature 76, 92–3, 94
proto-apocalyptic prophets 89
Psalms of Solomon 31, 171
Pseudepigrapha 201
Pseudo-Daniel A (4Q243–44) 148, 154, 155, 244
Pseudo-Daniel B (4Q245) 148, 150, 154, 155, 244
psychological trauma 39–41
Ptolemy II 160
Ptolemy VI 81
Ptolemy VII 81
Ptolemy IX (Lathyrus) Soter II 47, 49
Ptolemies, the 139
punishment of God 37–9

Qahat, Testament of 150, 151, 155
Qumran community 112–13, 118 n.68, 122–3
Qumran scrolls 7, 111–14, 122–3, 127, 130, 208–11 *see also* Aramaic literature
  1QM 190
  1QSb 170
  11QapostrZion 176
  4Q175 (4QTestimonia) 175, 220, 227
  4Q246 (4QApocryphon of Daniel ar) *see* 4Q246
  4Q339 150
  4Q378/379 (4QapocrJoshua) 175
  4Q385a (*Apocryphon of Jeremiah*) 53–4
  4Q387 (*Apocryphon of Jeremiah*) 53, 250
  4Q390 (*Apocryphon of Jeremiah C*^{e}) *see* 4Q390
  4Q448 175–6
  4Q521 5–6, 169–76, 179–80
  4Q556 148, 155, 244
  4Q556a 148, 155, 244
  4Q557 148, 155, 244
  4Q558 148, 154, 155, 244
  4QApocryphon of Daniel ar (4Q246) *see* 4Q246
  4QApocryphon of Jeremiah C^{e} (4Q390) *see* 4Q390
  4QBirth of Noah 90 *see also Birth of Noah, The*; *Birth of Noah* (4Q534–36)
  4QInstruction 90

4QpapApocalypse (4Q489) 148, 155
4QTestimonia (4Q175) 175, 220, 227
4QVision a-c (4Q556–558) 148, 154, 155, 244
6QApocalypse (6Q14) 148, 155
Apocryphon of Jeremiah (4Q385a) 53–4
Apocryphon of Jeremiah (4Q387) 53, 250
Apocryphon of Jeremiah C[e] (4Q390) *see* 4Q390
Apocryphon of Levi (4Q540–41) 148, 154, 244
Aramaic Levi Document (1QLevi, 4Q213a, 4Q213b) 90, 148, 150, 151, 155
Birth of Noah (4Q534–36) 148
Birth of Noah, The 148, 150, 151, 154, 155, 244 *see also 4QBirth of Noah* and *Birth of Noah* (4Q534–36)
Birth of Noah (4Q534–36) 148
Cave 4 166, 167
CD 209, 210
Four Kingdoms (4Q552–53) 148, 150, 154, 155, 244
Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20) 148, 150, 151–2, 154, 155, 244
Hodayot, the 170
Melchizedeq in 170–1
messianism and 179
New Jerusalem (1Q32, 2Q24, 4Q554, 554a, 555, 5Q15, 11Q18) 148, 151, 152, 1544, 155, 244
Pesher Nahum 209–10
Pseudo-Daniel A (4Q243–44) 148, 154, 155, 244
Pseudo-Daniel B (4Q245) 148, 150, 154, 155, 244
Self-Glorification Hymn (4Q471b, 4Q491c) 170
Son of God (4Q246) 148, 150, 151, 154, 155, 183–91, 193–5, 241, 244
Testament of Jacob (4Q537) 148, 150, 152, 154, 155, 244
Testimonia (4Q175) 220
Visions of Amram (4Q543–47) 148, 150, 151, 155, 244
Words of Michael (4Q529, 4Q571) 148, 150, 154, 155, 244

rabbinic intellectual activity 197–204, 208–10 see also *midrash*
"Re-written Bible" 201
redemption 76
religious identity 75
resistance groups 221–2, 228
resurrection 38–9
revelation 13, 19, 129, 238
revolution *see* unrest
ritual 106
Roberts, J. J. M. 16
Romans, the 30, 31, 244–5
Rowland, Christopher 95
Open Heaven, The 126
Rudolph, K. 74

Sabbath, violating the 221–2, 228
Sadducees, the: *Nahum Pesher*, and the 51
safar (translator/interpreter/diviner) 202, 205, 241
salespeople 117
Salome, Alexandra 29–30, 35, 137
salvation 76, 93, 186, 190
Samaria 66
sanctuary 129
SBL (Society of Biblical Literature's) Genres Project 71, 138
Schäfer, P. 125
Schiffman, L. 66–7
"Go Out and Study the Land" (Judges 18:2). Archaeological, Historical and Textual Studies in Honor of Hanan Eshel 123
Schofield, Alison 113, 128
Schøyen Collection 130
scribal creation 17–18
Scripture 201
hidden meanings in 199–200, 201, 202
Scriptures, Sects and Visions (Stone) 157
Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness, The 105, 111
Second Temple Judaism 69, 97–9
apocalyticism and *see* apocalypticism
Maccabean Revolt and *see* Maccabean Revolt
Second Temple literature 201
Seleucid empire 21, 25–7, 140
Seleucus IV 21, 140
Seleucus VI 47
Self-Glorification Hymn (4Q471b, 4Q491c) 170
Seventy Weeks Prophecy 217, 225–6, 248, 249, 250
Shechem, battle of 46–7, 50, 127
Shlomzion 137 *see also* Salome Alexandra
Sibylline Oracles 111 *see also Third Sibylline Oracles Book*
eschatology and 99
Maccabean Revolt and 81–2, 90
Siegfried, Andre 116–17
Silverman, Jason M.: *Persepolis and Jerusalem:*

Iranian influence on the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic 234
Similitudes, the 170, 171, 173 *see also* 1 Enoch
Simon Maccabee (Simon the Hasmonean) 27–8, 34, 150, 173–4, 219, 227
Sirach, Book of 34, 92, 176
Maccabean Revolt and 82, 90
social class 41, 138
social protest 39–41, 136 *see also* unrest
social sciences 121
society 41, 76–7, 107, 138, 239–43, 244
Society of Biblical Literature's (SBL) Genres Project 71, 138
sofer (scribe) 202, 205
soferim (law deciders) 202–3
Sohn-Gottes-Text 155
Son of God (4Q246) 148, 150, 151, 154, 155, 183–91, 193–5, 241, 244
Son of Man 169–76
Song of Hannah 180
Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice 129, 149 n.3, 170
Stone, Michael 14, 243
"Lists of Revealed Things" 95
Scriptures, Sects and Visions 157
"Visions and Pseudepigraphy" 205 n.29
Straton 47
suicide 38

t. Sukkah 58
Tabernacles, Festival of 49, 51
protest at 49, 50, 51, 58–9
talmûd 210
Talmud, the 197
Taylor, Joan E.: "Buried Manuscripts and Empty Tombs; The Qumran *Genizah* Theory Revisited" 123
Teacher of Righteousness 209
Testament of Abraham 135
Testament of Jacob (4Q537) 148, 150, 152, 154, 155, 244
Testament of Joseph 155
Testament of Judah 155
Testament of Moses 111
Testament of Qahat 150, 151, 155
Testimonia (4Q175) 220 *see also* 4QTestimonia (4Q175)
Theodotion 160–1
Theokratie und Eschataologie (Plöger, Otto) 157
Third Sibylline Oracles Book 140 *see also* *Sibylline Oracles*
eschatology and 99
Maccabean Revolt and 81–2
thrones 170
Tigranes II (the Great) of Armenia 33, 34–5, 40–1, 137
Tobit, Book of 114–16, 122, 135, 150, 151, 152, 155, 161, 176
"Tobit and Enoch: Distant Cousins with a Recognizable Resemblance" (Nickelsburg) 114–15
travel 118–19
Tryphon 27
ṭupšarru (inscriber on tablets) 203 n.22

unrest 119, 135, 137, 164–5, 167 *see also* social protest
Urim, the 15

Van der Veken, Jan 106
Vier Reiche 155
Vision of Gabriel 128
"Visions and Pseudepigraphy" (Stone) 205 n.29
Visions of Amram (4Q543–47) 148, 150, 151, 154, 155, 244
Vištasp 165

Watchers, Book of see *Book of Watchers*
Webb, Eugene, 107
Words of Michael (4Q529, 4Q571) 148, 150, 154, 155, 244
Works and Days (Hesiod) 160
"world empires" mythical complex 160, 161, 165, 166, 167, 168 *see also* empires
worldviews 103, 106–10, 120, 121, 134 *see also* apocalyptic worldviews
definition 133, 237–8
Worte Michaels 155

yahad, the 112–14, 119, 128, 129–30
Yannai 61–2
Yasna 246
YHWH 180–1
Yohanan (Rabbi) 197–8

Zand–ī Wahman Yasn (ZWY) 159–68, 232–3
Zand–ī Vahman Yašt (*Bahman Yašt*) 5, 245, 247–8
Zarathushtra 245
Zechariah apocalypse 238
Zoroastrianism 163, 164–5, 166, 167, 168, 245–7